

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 28th, 2016 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, you're a Marxist.

Sherab Dorje said:

Sometimes... And you seem to be blissfully unaware of the tensions that exist in society as a consequence of class.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, I just think they are not as important as the question of the environment.

Sherab Dorje said:

Of course there are desperate attempts to sublimate the tensions by promising proletarians the apparent opportunity to become members of the bourgeoisie, but as the stats (provided by boda) show: they ain't goin' nowhere!

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing can be promised to anyone other than a virtually lifeless, planetary desert if humanity does not abandon extractive economic practices. Since capitalism and its shadow, socialism, are both predicated on extractive economics, both are failures.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 27th, 2016 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is a recognition people with different value systems can arrive at the same conclusion and work together, the use the example of Buddhists and Christians who both oppose capital punishment.

This is why it is crucial to read Naess if one hopes to understand the core principles that underlie the deep ecological approach.

Sherab Dorje said:

Proletariat and Bourgeoisie together, fighting for the environment. Fat chance.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, you're a Marxist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 27th, 2016 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Minobu said:

again you decide what i am doing.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, it is really the other way around.

Minobu said:

well we could straighten that out by explaining to me why use edenic and the big bang thing the way you did.

if you really look at what i wrote i looked to you as some sort of teacher here....then it was like ignore totally what i write and insult the words with words to make it all look lame. i'm strictly talking here about the use of edenic and big bang.

also you ignore the main content of everything i write and just do some sort of troll thing to get reaction.

lol..it's actually amusing ...i lol about it all the time...your no light wieght in your thing.

d

(waits for a one liner from malcolm ignoring the crux of what i ask)lol

Malcolm wrote:

One) I did not troll your post. So stop saying that I did.

Two) I responded to what I thought were the essential points. We were discussing primordial buddhas. You kept insisting there was some pure state before samasara. I rejected this idea.

Three) The term edenic means "A state of purity before a fall."

Four) Quantum physics asserts that time and space are continua that can be mathematically described. This is fine as far as things go, but it really does not have anything to do with Buddhist concepts of space and time. Thus, your example of time as a circle is pretty irrelevant here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 27th, 2016 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Minobu said:

again you decide what i am doing.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, it is really the other way around.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 27th, 2016 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Minobu said:

why are you going there?

Malcolm wrote:

You began to talk about the theory of time in quantum physics.

Minobu said:

At the end of my day my grappling with concepts of Primordial Buddhas, and keeping an open mind to something actually defining whether there was one outside of the concept of Dharmakaya only school of thought or not is not going to alter my dedication to mine and other's liberation.

I've spent my entire life absorbing different schools of thought, jumping into various Buddhist sects, so on and on and on.

I see Nichiren Shonin's Dharma as my best way of integrating myself with the Buddha's Dharma to help myself and other sentient.

So.....Am i going to let trolling an online forum really upset me ... i really thought highly of you Malcolm but this....

I have this serious discussion and Malcolm decides to ignore what i say and confer that is about some edenic view. That was an insult for I'm not on some Christian fundamentalist site trying to talk of eden, I'm discussing something akin to a Samadhi state and the like.

Something again I would like to talk about seriously. I chose you Malcolm to help me.

Then just because i use a little quantum physics and Stephen Hawking theory it becomes some big bang discussion. For me it's a troll and i truly hope you enjoyed the stage Malcolm, you know what you did and i know so seriously if it brings you some joy that indeed at the end of the day gives me pleasure.

I don't think me saying the verdict is out on such a subject will hinder me, but I do know trying to annoy others is not healthy.

I can see you are quite upset about insults which do not exist. I said nothing for which I deserve to be addressed as a troll. I answered you directly and honestly, and you did not like my reply. I am content to let it rest there. But now you are insisting on making this personal, and that is not called for.

Okay, so can we say that "passion bodhi" is passion energy and "rainbow-like mental body" is the illusory body?

ཕྱིར་ཁམས་གསུམ་འཁོར་བའི་སེམས་ཅན་ལ། །འདྲོད་བའི་བྱང་ཆུབ་སྣ་ཚོགས་ཡོད།

I think it just means In general, there are various assertions regarding Bodhi for the beings in the three realms of Samsara.

R

In general, there are various awakenings asserted for the beings in the three realms of samsara.

This really explains everything perfectly:

```
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]
```

It is quite practical since it accommodates other positive approaches to the

environment and ecology.

Sherab Dorje said:

This is a political position known as populism.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is a recognition people with different value systems can arrive at the same conclusion and work together, the use the example of Buddhists and Christians who both oppose capital punishment.

This is why it is crucial to read Naess if one hopes to understand the core principles that underlie the deep ecological approach.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 27th, 2016 at 5:15 AM

Title: Re: The 5th Skandha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What does zhi mean in Sanskrit?

Astus said:

It can be a translation of various words. According to the Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Great Dictionary (佛教漢梵大辭典):

√jñā, -jñā, jñāna, vi-√jñā, pra-√jñā, √vid, -vid, ava-√budh; ajyate, adhigata, adhi-√gam, adhigamana, anugata, anugama, anujñāpita, anu-pra-√viś, anupraviṣṭa, anu-√budh, anubodha, anumāna, anusāritva, anusmaraṇatā, antara-jñā, abhi-√gam, -abhiñā, abhi-√jñā, abhisambodhanatā, abhisambodhi, ava-√gam, avagama, ava-√gāh, avatāra, avatīrṇa, ava-√tṛ, avadhāraka, avabudhyanatā, avabodha, avabodhana, avê(√i), avêkṣ(√ikṣ), avetya, ā-√jñā, ājñā, ājñākhyā, ājñāta, ājñātāva, ājñāna, ājñēndriya, ājñeya, āsada, ucyate, udaya, upalakṣaṇa, upalakṣyate, upalabdhi, eṣṭavya, kovida, √kṣam, gatiṃ-gata, √gam, gamyate, gāmin, √gāh, √grah, grahaṇa, cetana, jānaka, jñāta, jñāpita, jñeya, drśyate, drṣṭvā, draṣṭavya, nidhyapti, nidhyāpta, niścaya, parāyaṇa, parikuśala, pari-cchid(√chid), pari-√ñā, pariñā, pariñāta, pariñāna, pariñānatā, pariñāyate, prajāna, prajānat*, prajñā, prajñāna, pratiñāyate, prati-√budh, pratibhāvayati, prativijñapti, prati-vi-√jñā, prativijñāna, pratividdha, prativibhāvayati, pratedha, prati-√vyadh, pratisamvidita, pratisamvedana, pratī(√i), praty-anu-√bhū, pratyabhijñā, pratyabhijñāna, pra-vi-√ci, buddhi, budhyanatā, budhyanā, bodha, bhajana, mata, √man, manas, lakṣyate, labdha, va-√gāh, vicārayati, vi-√ci, vijñapti, vijñā, vijñāta, vijñāpana, vijñāyate, vidita, vidhi-jñā, vibuddhana, vibhāvayati, vibhāvita, vibhāvayate, vettr, veda, veditavya, vedin, sam-lakṣaya (den.), sam-√jñā, sam-anu-√drś, sam-anu-√paś, sam-anv-ā-√hr, sam-√āp, samudāgama, sam-√jñā, sam-pra-√drś, sunīścita, smṛti.

Malcolm wrote:

What is the most common Sanskrit term it represents?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 27th, 2016 at 5:14 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The means of production are capitalist, and only exist because they were created by capitalists. There was never any industrial means of production that was not created by capitalism. Socialism merely wishes to replace the ownership of those means.

Sherab Dorje said:

A machine is a machine, it is neither capitalist or socialist. It is a bunch of nuts and bolts.

Malcolm wrote:

Not so, the nature of machinery is reflected of the kind of economy that produces it.

Sherab Dorje said:

The problem is the means themselves.

Hmmmmmm... And what if the means were used to produce ecologically sound products?

Malcolm wrote:

They can't be so used. That is point that everyone on both the left and the right fails to understand.

Sherab Dorje said:

That is why ecology will fail as a mass movement, because it does not directly appeal to the masses (who happen to be proletariat, or lumpen proletariat and or "coloured").

That is why it is a white middle class phenomenon.

Malcolm wrote:

Ecology will fail as a mass movement providing that people refuse to understand the peril that faces us collectively as biosphere.

One can be sure that Alt-right people are profligately ignorant of it, in fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 27th, 2016 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: The 5th Skandha

Content:

Astus said:

There is no separate awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

This the basic problem with translated the term "rigpa" as "awareness."

It simply does not work.

treehuggingoctopus said:

Malcolm, do you think it would be better then to render it as "knowing" or "knowledge"?
The latter word too carries a lot of baggage...

Malcolm wrote:

In many cases yes. For example, in the commentary on one of the seventeen tantras, rig pa, vidyā, is defined in the following way:

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) knowledge of the link of consciousness, sharp and dull worldly knowledge and so on, and 5) the knowledge of the essence (snying po) that permeates all is this [knowledge] that is without ignorance, unobscured by the obscurations of ignorance and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 27th, 2016 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: The 5th Skandha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"Awareness" is a term which is next to useless in a Buddhist context.

Astus said:

What do you suggest? <https://books.google.com/books?id=bUgg9aWaAH8C> translated zhi 知 as "knowing".

Malcolm wrote:

What does zhi mean in Sanskrit?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 27th, 2016 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Socialism is capitalism since it does not reject the capitalist mode of production.

Sherab Dorje said:

It is an industrial mode of production, not a capitalist mode.

The means of production are the same, the aims are slightly different.

Malcolm wrote:

The means of production are capitalist, and only exist because they were created by capitalists. There was never any industrial means of production that was not created by capitalism. Socialism merely wishes to replace the ownership of those means.

The problem is the means themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 27th, 2016 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Socialism is capitalism.

Sherab Dorje said:

Sorry, but I think this is mistaken. It is like saying a zebra is a horse because they both have four legs, a tail and go "neigh".

It is this kind of thinking that has stunted US domestic policy and left movements since the McCarthy era.

Malcolm wrote:

Socialism is capitalism since it does not reject the capitalist mode of production.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 27th, 2016 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: The 5th Skandha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This the basic problem with translated the term "rigpa" as "awareness."

It simply does not work.

Astus said:

Doesn't have to be "rigpa". Buddha-nature has been identified as awareness (zhi 知) by some Chan teachers as well. Interestingly, zhi 知 means both "to know" and "to be aware".

Malcolm wrote:

"Awareness" is a term which is next to useless in a Buddhist context.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 27th, 2016 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Minobu said:

why are you going there?

Malcolm wrote:

You began to talk about the theory of time in quantum physics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

because then you exclude the effects of non-capitalist industrialisation.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing. The world economy is and has been capitalist for three hundred years. Socialism is capitalism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 11:46 PM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Minobu said:

If you read what I have written i am saying samsara is of itself.

the key ingredient here is desire ,hence dependent origination. I'm not saying samsara is not beginningless just explaining to the modern public why this observation takes place.

Malcolm wrote:

The key ingredients of samsara are the afflictions. But those arise from ignorance.

Samsara has an end, that end is called nirvana.

ahh even you agree that the goal is to end Nirvana ..what will be left then eh![/quote]

I did not say the goal was to end nirvana. I said, in contrast to your statement that samsara has no end that indeed samsara has an end. It ends (ends for you) when nirvana begins. Of course, the corollary is that nirvana has no end, but it does have a beginning.

possibly something that was before the introduction of desire into the picture.

There was no state prior to the arising of samsara because samsara is beginningless.

There is no "big bang" for samsara. The idea of a first big bang is not consistent with dependent origination, so it is either false or Buddha's teaching of dependent

origination is false. The idea that the material universe contracts and expands without beginning however is perfectly consistent with dependent origination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: The 5th Skandha

Content:

Astus said:

There is no separate awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

This the basic problem with translated the term "rigpa" as "awareness."

It simply does not work.

Monlam Tharchin said:

I've always wondered what "rigpa" means to an average Tibetan person. Is it an everyday word with problematic associations like "awareness" in English, or is it a more narrow, specialized term?

Malcolm wrote:

It is an everyday word. It is the verb "to know," or the noun, knowledge. Rig pa po, for example, simply means "the knower."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

conebeckham said:

According to my dictionary, "primordial" can mean "existing at the beginning of time," but it can also mean "fundamental."

Time is illusory, just as all of samsara is illusory. There can therefore be no beginning of time, much less anything which exists at the beginning of time--but, from within a "closed system" of illusion, samsara, one could perhaps understand the primordial Buddha as the fundamental state. As Malcolm has said, this fundamental state is connate with the very non-knowing which obscures knowledge of the state. Time itself is a result of this non-knowing.

Queequeg said:

Fundamental Nescience - I don't know the Chinese. In Japanese its called 元本の無明 gampon no mumyo. I assume the Chinese is 元本無明

Its the level of ignorance overcome at the Buddha's enlightenment.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in Sanskrit this is called saḥajāvidyā, connate ignorance. It is the most subtle knowledge obscuration that is the very last thing to be removed prior to mounting the stage of buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: The 5th Skandha

Content:

Astus said:

There is no separate awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

This the basic problem with translated the term "rigpa" as "awareness."

It simply does not work.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Minobu said:

Samsara is beginningless due to mass .. mass creates time.

Malcolm wrote:

No, samsara is beginningless because of dependent origination. It has nothing to do with mass, time, the big bang or physics.

Minobu said:

time eventually bends upon itself creating a circle of time which has no beginning and no end. Hence the observation that Samsara has no beginning and no end

Malcolm wrote:

This idea of time has nothing to with the subject matter. This idea is from physics.

Samsara has an end, that end is called nirvana.

Minobu said:

samsara came into existence

Malcolm wrote:

Samsara did not come into existence at all because it is beginningless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Minobu said:

glad you talking about the pure state before Samsara happening though.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it never existed because samsara is beginningless. This is basic.

Minobu said:

To deny time is just that.

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgārjuna pointed out that time is not established. This is also basic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

a subject that any educated Geshe would simply say " The verdict is still out on this one". No, it really isn't. We can call the dharmakāya the primordial buddha if we like, but the dharmakāya does not exist inside of time, so it is not really "primordial."

Minobu said:

Listen to what you just posted and answer me this. Define Primordial Buddha. You cannot , hence the verdict is still out. Your post is not a definition of anything , except in denying that it really has not been defined as in Sambhogakaya is well defined.

Malcolm wrote:

The Chandrakīrti citation I provided defines the two possibilities very well. It shows that one possibility, that of temporal first buddha, is impossible, while providing a usage for the term which is applicable to the dharmakāya. You further speculated about a pure mind that existed before samsara, and I rejected that possibility because ignorance is connate, arising together with the mind from the very beginning without being inherent to the mind in anyway. Even Samantabhadra had ignorance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Minobu said:

As you should know the one true difference between Hinduism and Buddhism is the concept of Atman. Where Hindus see a created transmigrating inherent soul ,we see mind through the knowledge of Sunyata.

Now take a glimpse of the whole concept of returning to Paramatman and you get a glimpse of what I am so ineffectual at pointing to for you malcolm. I am not saying Paramatman is accepted just using it to point to something other ,similar in INTENT.

Malcolm wrote:

I understand your point. There is no pure state to which to return. That is how I answered you.

Minobu said:

a subject that any educated Geshe would simply say " The verdict is still out on this one".

Malcolm wrote:

No, it really isn't. We can call the dharmakāya the primordial buddha if we like, but the dharmakāya does not exist inside of time, so it is not really "primordial."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Minobu said:

the original cause to create Samsara from this pure state I read in a book by a Tulku and asked a Tulku about and everything was fine until i said "If it was so pure how did we make such a big mistake and act on desire" not my original quote but it will do..

.

Malcolm wrote:

I understand your point. I replied. There was never any pure mind prior to samsara in time. Such a theory is utterly false and not consistent with Buddhadharma at all, even if some tulku enunciated it.

The Buddhist understanding of time is different than that of modern physics.

Minobu said:

When I get the book and the chapter on it I will post it.

I could be using the word purity and pure state when another word , which means the same thing , was used.

the Eden thing i took as a shot at trivializing my post. I will apologize and offer my hand. You might not have meant to ridicule. hopefully anyway..

i know im lousy at apologies when hurt.

as per Time and Buddhist understanding , like I already posted in this thread ...

A Nichiren ShoShu priest used his dinner plate to describe time and Hawking's theory .

A Tulku said it was a circle like Hawking's theory only each time around it is slightly different.

i dunno Malcolm , Ive been at this since i'm 15 and now 61 .. Ive met all kinds of people .

Had talks about stuff through a translator with His holiness the Ninth Khalkha Jetsun Dhampa of Mongolia.

He showed me how to bend the channels into the centre channel. I know name dropping sucks...but you don;t know me and you seem to just dismiss stuff after you actually agreed with it.

I think you might have reading disabilities, when it comes to reading me...

And yet you are a storehouse of knowledge and much more...i respect you...

Malcolm wrote:

Time is not established as truly existent. It is a perception for deluded sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

boda said:

Indeed, and isn't the Green Party on the front line? ... and not doing so hot.

Malcolm wrote:

The Green Party is just a green-washed party of the old left. This is why it is going nowhere.

boda said:

Is there any evidence that deep ecology is going somewhere?

Malcolm wrote:
Sure, of course it is.

boda said:
Deep ecology is far more akin to a religion than a practical solution to ecological imbalance, or rather, the survival of our civilization, if not our species.

Malcolm wrote:
It is quite practical since it accommodates other positive approaches to the environment and ecology. If you are going to continue to comment about deep ecology, I suggest you read Arne Naess' essay on Ecosophy T.

Now, this really is time for:

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 11:20 AM
Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:
Minobu said:
the original cause to create Samsara from this pure state I read in a book by a Tulku and asked a Tulku about and everything was fine until i said "If it was so pure how did we make such a big mistake and act on desire" not my original quote but it will do..
.

Malcolm wrote:
I understand your point. I replied. There was never any pure mind prior to samsara in time. Such a theory is utterly false and not consistent with Buddhadharma at all, even if some tulku enunciated it.

The Buddhist understanding of time is different than that of modern physics.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 11:16 AM
Title: Re: Some towns in France ban burkinis

Content:
Fa Dao said:
this might revive the conversation...
<http://www.breitbart.com/london/2016/09/24/french-burkini-controversy-was-set-up-by-muslim-activist-family-in-concert-with-television-station/>

Malcolm wrote:
Breitbart, seriously?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 11:03 AM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Minobu said:

and using the word edenic state is really insulting. [/b]

Malcolm wrote:

I don't see how.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 11:02 AM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Minobu said:

[

There was a state before Samsara ...somehow desire crept into the picture which created the cause for attachment which created the cause for Karma.

]

Malcolm wrote:

No, there was never a pure state before samsara. If there was a pure state before samsara, one has to explain where samsara comes from, since it does not arise from itself. Even if you say that desire and other afflictions "creep in," and provide a cause for samsara, still they must have causes too, and cannot be self-originated.

We say that while the mind is inherently pure, since there is never any time the mind itself found this state of purity, ignorance is therefore connate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 10:35 AM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Minobu said:

How does one say there is no beginning ?

.

Malcolm wrote:

Because it contradicts dependent origination.

Minobu said:

if there is no desire and zero karma >pre Samsara, then there is no interdependent co arising of anything. there is just pure mind without any manifestation of anything.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Ignorance is connate, but not innate.

There is no temporal state of primeval purity. There is no edenic state from which we fell.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 10:31 AM

Title: Re: Blue robes/clothes

Content:

RikudouSennin said:

Was there ever a time that there was a "blue sangha"?

Malcolm wrote:

Mahasamghika monks wore blue robes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 10:19 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

boda said:

Deep ecology is defined as an ecological and environmental philosophy promoting the inherent worth of living beings regardless of their instrumental utility to human needs, plus a radical restructuring of modern human societies in accordance with such ideas.

Radically restructuring society somehow doesn't involve politics?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a political program nor a party. It is philosophical framework about these issues and their solutions. But it is not exclusive of other approaches to the same questions. It does not make a pretense of being monolithic in its approach, i.e, "The front is long", as Naess remarked.

boda said:

Indeed, and isn't the Green Party on the front line? ... and not doing so hot.

Malcolm wrote:

The Green Party is just a green-washed party of the old left. This is why it is going nowhere.

But party politics do not change society, nor do elections. Only mass movements make change.

The present climate crisis is a result of industrial capitalism. It will not be solved by the kind of thinking that produced industrial capitalism in the first place.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Thinking that issues of class can be resolved alongside the resolution of environmental issues is a distraction. The environment is more important. Without dealing with the environment, the resolution of class issues will just be patches.

Sherab Dorje said:

A distraction??? You think that environmental issues do not (also) have to do with class, capital and profit???

Like I said: "They are not separate issues. That is why Deep Ecology failed politically."

I should add: "...and will continue to fail politically".

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a political position. It's a philosophical and ethical framework out of which decisions might be made. Since people seem never to read Naess, they never get what he is talking about.

Deep ecology is a way of arriving at a system of values, which can then be expressed through political action. The expression of those values may be no different in expression than the way so called Social Ecologists express their convictions. For example, most Buddhists are, by and large, opposed to capital punishment for any reason; so are many Catholics. The framework through which they arrive at their shared opposition to capital punishment are utterly different, but in terms of the movement that they share, the outcome desired is mutual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

They are not separate issues. That is why Deep Ecology failed politically.

Malcolm wrote:

Thinking that deep ecologically is a political movement is shallow.

boda said:

Deep ecology is defined as an ecological and environmental philosophy promoting the inherent worth of living beings regardless of their instrumental utility to human needs, plus a radical restructuring of modern human societies in accordance with such ideas.

Radically restructuring society somehow doesn't involve politics?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a political program nor a party. It is philosophical framework about these issues and their solutions. But it is not exclusive of other approaches to the same questions. It does not make a pretense of being monolithic in its approach, i.e, "The front is long", as Naess remarked.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Minobu said:

How does one say there is no beginning ?

.

Malcolm wrote:

Because it contradicts dependent origination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Thinking that deep ecologically is a political movement is shallow.

Sherab Dorje said:

It is not even a political movement anymore due to its inability to garner a base of support larger than a small insular group of white Malthusian rednecks.

Malcolm wrote:

Deep ecology is not malthusian. The population explosion happened for two main reasons: yams and potatoes from the Colombian exchange, which addressed food scarcity issues in China and Europe respectively; followed by the petroleum age.

We do recognize that humans have well exceeded the carrying capacity of the planet—that is should we wish to preserve any species that are not immediately useful to us. What deep ecological thinking recognizes that standard leftist thinking does not, is that rivers, trees, birds, fish, nonhuman mammals etc., have rights, and that we should not feel we have the right to use more than we minimally need.

Sherab Dorje said:

Who said anything about "first" and "last"?

Malcolm wrote:

Thinking that issues of class can be resolved alongside the resolution of environmental issues is a distraction. The environment is more important. Without dealing with the environment, the resolution of class issues will just be patches.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed. But this is all a distraction. The environment is more important.

Sherab Dorje said:

They are not separate issues. That is why Deep Ecology failed politically.

Malcolm wrote:

Thinking that deep ecologically is a political movement is shallow.

Further, thinking that environmental issues will be resolved by resolving issues of class first is very mistaken. Socialism has no better a track record than capitalism with respect to the environment because socialism in all its forms never reject the capitalist mode of production. In fact, it is regarded as progressive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

DGA said:

The emergence of the alt-right, the Brexit vote, the Trump situation... I think all these are in part a consequence of a refusal among liberal (center-left and neoliberal) programs and politicians to acknowledge class-based grievances, or to allow any discourse of class at all.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree with this. In fact, they are responding to a right-wing racist platform of class grievances.

DGA said:

My point is that the only lexicon they have to articulate a class grievance is a right-wing racist one, because the narrative of class grievance as such became taboo in the Reagan-Clinton years.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed. But this is all a distraction. The environment is more important.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 26th, 2016 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

DGA said:

The emergence of the alt-right, the Brexit vote, the Trump situation... I think all these are in part a consequence of a refusal among liberal (center-left and neoliberal) programs and politicians to acknowledge class-based grievances, or to allow any discourse of class at all.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree with this. In fact, they are responding to a right-wing racist platform of class grievances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2016 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: Does anyone recognise these text?

Content:

diamind said:

Do you know what these text are? Are they from kangyur? and the English name Toppoche (stobs po che)

Malcolm wrote:

This is the nineteenth chapter of the explanatory tantra of the dgongs pa zang thal, often referred to in English as the "Aspiration of Samantabhadra" (not to be confused with with sūtra text of similar name).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2016 at 9:00 PM

Title: Re: I'm lost in my practice, someone can help enlighten me?

Content:

taidangau said:

I mean I still believe in Buddha and his teachings, BUT NOT TO SANGHA!!!!!! Despite the fact that I had taken refuge in front of the 3 jewels, Buddha of course, Dharma naturally, BUT SANGHA?

Malcolm wrote:

When you are a Mahāyānist, you only take refuge in the Ārya Bodhisattva Sangha, not the sangha of monks and nuns, nor even the Sangha of Ārya Śrāvakas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2016 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Frankly, you seem to fetishize power.

Malcolm wrote:

Most Trumpistas do. Which is bizarre, because their candidate is a weakling, a complete sissy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2016 at 6:56 PM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

dreambow said:

I get your drift but I want to have a say. I don't want distant bureaucrats and politicians making policy on the run, unaware, possibly indifferent to the outcome. I want a referendum in each country, let the people speak. Don't trot out another so called expert...not interested. Let the man in the street have his say and if the media and the vested interests can shut up the people may have a voice and point the way forward.

Malcolm wrote:

We are talking about the fact that one out of roughly every twelfth person on the planet is a refugee.

<http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2015/06/refugees-global-peace-index/396122/>

Inge said:

That is 1 out of 122 people according to the linked article.

Malcolm wrote:

Math is definitely not my strong suit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2016 at 6:08 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

Rakz said:

=you have pretty much no clue what you're talking about.

Malcolm wrote:

You pretty much are a victim of neoliberal propaganda. You should look at the pew world income research I provided.

And have you ever been to either country? I have. Indian "Middle class" is a relative term.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2016 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: Living with idle chatter all around you

Content:

Boomerang said:

All of my friends are nihilists. I don't think their views are going to corrupt me, but our entire relationships are based on indulging in idle chatter, and that upsets me. Sometimes the thought arises that I should cut them out of my life, but that seems like an unrealistic and unkind way of dealing with samsara as a lay person. Besides my friends, I'll still have to regularly interact with idle talkers, Buddhist and non-Buddhist, for the rest of my life.

Yesterday while talking with a friend, I subtly tried to steer the conversation toward reflecting on compassion and ethics, but it was still 90% idle chatter.

I don't know how to turn this into a good thing. Should I just accept that as long as I'm a member of society I'll have to engage in idle chatter and then do purification practices?

Malcolm wrote:

Idle chatter can be one of the means of conversion. Mahāyāna permits what Hinayāna prohibits.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2016 at 3:52 AM

Title: Re: Blue robes/clothes

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No one anymore. But Guru P's shirt is blue,

Losal Samten said:

Would that have been blue proper or the krsna blue/black?

Malcolm wrote:
Sky blue.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2016 at 2:35 AM
Title: Re: Blue robes/clothes
Content:
RikudouSennin said:
What group of tantics wear blue?

Malcolm wrote:
No one anymore. But Guru P's shirt is blue, symbolizing he is a mantra practitioner.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2016 at 2:17 AM
Title: Re: Goraksha
Content:
maybay said:
It seems strange that such an influential Mahasiddha shouldn't leave an actual instruction lineage.

Malcolm wrote:
He was not that influential among Buddhists.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2016 at 2:14 AM
Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem
Content:

Rakz said:
India and China as big examples.

Malcolm wrote:
India and China are in fact superb examples of how difficult it is to recover from aggressive colonialism. It has little to do with Marx or other political theories.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2016 at 1:49 AM
Title: Re: The levels of SMS training
Content:

florin said:

Can you give the titles and the order of the practices of the mind series as they are spread over the 3 levels ?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I cannot tell you that. You have to go through the levels to discover precisely what is practiced when and where. Or you can ask ChNN directly. But we are not supposed to discuss the content of the individual levels. Sorry.

florin said:

Why not ?

By listing titles you are not revealing the contents of the practices involved ?

I do not understand how sometime we can discuss tantras and their content related to view but sometime we cannot. Arent all dzogchen tantras supposed to be secret ?

Malcolm wrote:

There was once a man who was told by his teacher that he had something very secret to teach him. So, with much anticipation, he showed up on the appointed day, and was given a very common Vajrapani mantra to recite. With great disappointment he exclaimed, "This is very common, there is nothing secret about it at all." To which the Lama replied, "It is true that this is a very common mantra, but you must practice this very secretly, then you will gain siddhis."

Long and short of it, we were told by ChNN not to discuss the content of SMS training at all. But it common knowledge at this point that level one has a formal ngondro, refuge, bodhicitta and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2016 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Goraksha

Content:

maybay said:

What of him? Does he continue in any Tibetan Buddhist lineages?

Malcolm wrote:

His empowerment is included in the empowerments of the 84 Mahasiddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2016 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: The levels of SMS training

Content:

florin said:

Can someone list the levels of SMS training as they are done in DC?

I only know the base level.

Malcolm wrote:

There are nine levels not including the base: three for the mind series; three for the space series; and three for the intimate instruction series. To my knowledge, no training has been held beyond the level 4.

florin said:

Can you give the titles and the order of the practices of the mind series as they are spread over the 3 levels ?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I cannot tell you that. You have to go through the levels to discover precisely what is practiced when and where. Or you can ask ChNN directly. But we are not supposed to discuss the content of the individual levels. Sorry.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 25th, 2016 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: The levels of SMS training

Content:

florin said:

Can someone list the levels of SMS training as they are done in DC?

I only know the base level.

Malcolm wrote:

There are nine levels not including the base: three for the mind series; three for the space series; and three for the intimate instruction series. To my knowledge, no training has been held beyond the level 4.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: are you someone special?

Content:

tomschwarz said:

identity...

Malcolm wrote:

...is not the problem. Clinging to it, or thinking it is real, is the problem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Queequeg said:

None of it is trifling. It's all life and death serious. If any of this is trifling to Buddha, then Buddha is bull shit.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhas only see other buddhas. They do not perceive sentient beings at all, just buddhas. In other words, when a buddha looks at any being we would call sentient, all they see is a buddha.

.

Minobu said:

That really says a lot and is probably going to slowly work it's way into my being and change a whole paradigm.

Like I really needed that running in the background..lol.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that all worlds and buddhafiels, pure or impure, are contained within the body of the mahāsambhogakāya.

Minobu said:

Pure or impure Buddhafiels? If you have the time could you talk of this a little further , it might help in other ways as per it's meaning.

And when you say contained , can you use other words to push me into a better realization of what you are telling us.

d

Malcolm wrote:

A pure buddhafiels is Sukhavati, there is no suffering there at all. An impure buddhafiels is this Sahaloka, since there is suffering. All are contained with the body of the mahāsambhogakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: Why is Amitabha absent in American Zen and TB?

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Do you know what text this mantra is from?

Noone knows.

I'm guessing one of the lower tantras.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a Tibetan corruption of Om Amithbha hrih, according to the famed Sakya Kilaya master and polymath, Amyezhab.

BuddhaFollower said:

And where did Om Amithbha hrih come from?

Malcolm wrote:

It is a name mantra. It does not come from any tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: I am the Father of this world

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is well established that Shakyamuni's buddhafiield is in fact this Sahaloka. See the Vimalakirti Sutra.

Coëmgenu said:

But my question is is this the only name for said land and is this the only way such a land can be understood to exist. Doesn't sahaloka mean "this world"? We call this world "the saha world". We call a world "loka" in Sanskrit.

Malcolm wrote:

Saha means "unbearable." It refers to this entire billion world system in which is found our world, which contains Jambudvipa (India).

Loka means world, sphere, universe. In this case Sahaloka means the Unbearable Universe because it is a place of misery and suffering.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Queequeg said:

None of it is trifling. It's all life and death serious. If any of this is trifling to Buddha, then Buddha is bull shit.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhas only see other buddhas. They do not perceive sentient beings at all, just buddhas. In other words, when a buddha looks at any being we would call sentient, all they see is a buddha.

Queequeg said:

本佛 revealed himself to us in the form of Shakyamuni. He could have revealed himself in any number of other ways, but this is the way he did. I can't see Mahavairocana's palm, hand, or even a ridge of his palm print. I don't hear Mahavairocana's voice. But I do hear Shakyamuni. I see his srarira. He appeared as Shakyamuni in response to my afflictions, my perfect upaya.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that all worlds and buddhafiels, pure or impure, are contained within the body of the mahāsambhogakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

. Candrakīrti's explanation is perfect:

As for the ādibuddha, some claim it does exist because a buddhahood without gathering accumulations is not reasonable; if there is no other buddha, the gathering accumulations itself is not reasonable; and because of beginninglessness, a single buddha is also not reasonable. Also many buddhas are not asserted because the dharmakāya is undifferentiated within the immaculate dhātu. Therefore, from the perspective of the dharmakāya, the time of full awakening and the time of being are not at odds. Therefore, from the perspective of the dharmakāya, it is also reasonable to present an ādibuddha, because ultimate nature of the dharmakāya is single."

Minobu said:

I have a problem with the bolded out text.

I started this thread due to the fact which I hold as essential to the whole concept of attaining Buddhahood.

One needed to be a samsaric being in the cycle of rebirth, amass Karma, do the right thing and acquire merit, and somehow attain Buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Minobu said:

So A Primordial Being/ Buddha from the beginning of the beginning in the no beginning universe is at odds with the words above "because a buddhahood without gathering

accumulations is not reasonable"

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because according to sūtra, a buddha needs to gather accumulations by respecting and honoring another buddha while that buddha is still on the bodhisattva path.

Minobu said:

Also the Dharma Kaya Body is produced upon enlightenment ...yes/no ????

Malcolm wrote:

The dharmakāya is seen when one mounts the stage of full buddhahood. The sambhogakāya is seen when one mounts the pure bhūmis. The nirmanakāya is all that one can see while one is an ordinary person or a bodhisattva on the impure stages.

Minobu said:

also I don't think it is beginningless, for there is a teaching somewhere in Tibetan Buddhism where there was this pure state before Desire crept into the picture, and samsara was created.

Malcolm wrote:

That state does not exist in time, and so therefore, it does not contradict the beginninglessness of samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 8:53 PM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

TreeHuggingOctopus said:

(Marx) was much less of a diehard materialist than the champions of neoliberalism are, truth be told.

Wayfarer said:

But it's not true. Marx was a dedicated, die-hard materialist, I wouldn't gild the lily - he did his doctoral thesis on Democritus' atomism and famously 'stood Hegel on his head'. I agree with your other points, but the inconvenient truth is that capitalism alone has devised the means to harness the amazing power of modern science and to literally lift billions out of poverty.

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, you have checked world income levels? And what is your idea of poverty?

Capitalism has destroyed subsistence living for billions of people, sent them to the

cities in search of employment since they are not capable to surviving in a cash economy on their traditional land, and forced billions of people into sweat shops, etc.

Here are some real stats for you the world population:

Poor = 15%

Low income = 56%

Middle income = 13%

Upper-middle income 9%

High income = 7%

The income groups are defined as follows: The poor live on \$2 or less daily, low income on \$2.01-10, middle income on \$10.01-20, upper-middle income on \$20.01-50, and high income on more than \$50; figures expressed in 2011 purchasing power parities in 2011 prices.

Taken from <https://www.pewglobal.org/interactives/global-population-by-income/>

The poor and low income people make up an astonishing 71% of the world's population.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 11:25 AM

Title: Re: I am the Father of this world

Content:

Coëmgenu said:

Do Buddhas' not generate their Buddha Fields?

Malcolm wrote:

Shakyamunis buddhafield is this Sahaloka, not just vulture peak.

Coëmgenu said:

not just vulture peak

Is the Pure Land of Shakyamuni limited to one name? To one definition?

If Shakyamuni is the Primordial Buddha, is his Pure Land not the Primordial Pure Land as well, generated by the Primordial Buddha? I think the description of the Pure Land atop the Holy Eagle Peak seems to match the definitions of a "Primordial Buddha Field" to accompany the Primordial Buddha. But that is only something *I* think. I do not claim to be a Buddhadharma expert.

PS: I do not intend to be arrogant or aggressively insistent, if thats how I come across, I am aware that my insistent questioning can be tiresome, especially on the internet, where intentions are shrouded and often misinterpreted.

Malcolm wrote:

It is well established that Shakyamuni's buddhafiield is in fact this Sahaloka. See the Vimalakirti Sutra. Every planet in this billion world syestem has a Vajrasana, a Rajagriha, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 11:23 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

dreambow said:

I get your drift but I want to have a say. I don't want distant bureaucrats and politicians making policy on the run, unaware, possibly indifferent to the outcome. I want a referendum in each country, let the people speak. Don't trot out another so called expert...not interested. Let the man in the street have his say and if the media and the vested interests can shut up the people may have a voice and point the way forward.

Malcolm wrote:

We are talking about the fact that one out of roughly every twelfth person on the planet is a refugee.

<http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2015/06/refugees-global-peace-index/396122/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 11:14 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

dreambow said:

I get your drift but I want to have a say. I don't want distant bureaucrats and politicians making policy on the run, unaware, possibly indifferent to the outcome. I want a referendum in each country, let the people speak. Don't trot out another so called expert...not interested. Let the man in the street have his say and if the media and the vested interests can shut up the people may have a voice and point the way forward.

Malcolm wrote:

The funny thing about people who distrust the media is that they get of their "trustworthy" information from the media.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 11:10 AM

Title: Re: I am the Father of this world

Content:

Coëmgenu said:

Is the "this world" not the Pure Land of the Holy Eagle Peak? Isn't that the direct context of the verse-section, "my Pure Land is not destroyed" etc?

Malcolm wrote:
No.

Coëmgenu said:
Do Buddhas' not generate their Buddha Fields?

Malcolm wrote:
Shakyaunis buddhafield is this Sahaloka, not just vulture peak.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 10:52 AM
Title: Re: I am the Father of this world
Content:
Coëmgenu said:
Is the "this world" not the Pure Land of the Holy Eagle Peak? Isn't that the direct context of the verse-section, "my Pure Land is not destroyed" etc?

Malcolm wrote:
No.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 10:48 AM
Title: Re: Primordial Buddha
Content:
Queequeg said:
Mahavairocana did not appear as a historical Buddha. This does not mean mahavairocana is not a legit Buddha. Just not the Buddha who appeared as Buddha for people of the Saha world in this age.

Malcolm wrote:
You don't get it. We live inside of the body of Mahavairocana. There are no budhafields not included in Mahavairocana's body. We live in a world system which is contained in the palm of his hand, Kusumatalagarbha-alamkara. From that point of view, the goings on in our own little Sahaloka are but trifles.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 10:41 AM
Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem
Content:
dreambow said:
'Until now, the Swedish media have concealed the problems associated with immigration. All those who tried to describe reality were intimidated and

silenced by epithets such as “racist” and “Nazi”.

For decades, the only legitimate view was the claim that immigration enriches Sweden. Each report that appeared in the public media, namely the liberal-leftist kind, concluded with such a statement'

Only recently — since ten thousand immigrants have been pouring into Sweden every week, and the government, police, customs authorities and Migration Agency have no idea how to manage the issue — has Sweden begun to talk openly about the reality.

Malcolm wrote:

The fact is that there are something like 64,000,000 displaced persons in the world right now, a little less than 10% of the world population. As such, all countries, especially first world nations, should just step up and absorb the social cost of their own capital expansion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 10:35 AM

Title: Re: Why is Amitabha absent in American Zen and TB?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Om Amidevi hriḥ is a very common mantra.

BuddhaFollower said:

Do you know what text this mantra is from?

Noone knows.

I'm guessing one of the lower tantras.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a Tibetan corruption of Om Amithbha hriḥ, according to the famed Sakya Kilaya master and polymath, Amyezhab.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 10:05 AM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

RikudouSennin said:

Is there a non buddhist philosophy that is closest to Vajrayana/Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

No, for none of them truly comprehend emptiness even nominally. Since they don't truly comprehend emptiness, their perception of appearances is mistaken.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 7:53 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

Admin_PC said:

[EDIT: Scotch-Irish are Presbyterian, but they are Celtic,

Coëmgenu said:

Even the social construction of "Scotch-Irish" is a neocolonial holdover from the rape and pillage of Ireland by the English. The so-called "Scotch-Irish" are really just the people of Ulster, the Celtic kingdom of north-most Ireland. Years of plantations and orangism made us ashamed to be Irish, so we made up a new identity that seemed more British. This is coming from a Scotch-Irish former Presbyterian. Not that that makes me more historically learned, being from a certain group, but I can feel tangibly the effects of British supremacy in my family to this day.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is virtually nothing Scottish about the so called Scotch-Irish. I'm a McNab, so I ought to know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 7:52 AM

Title: Deep Ecology

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[Moderator Note: Split from: <http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=47&t=23754>]

Wayfarer said:

The world badly needs an alternative to capitalism that isn't communism, in my view.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is called deep ecology/ left biocentrism, where "left" does not mean Marxist or even Socialist, but merely anti-capitalist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 7:50 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

MiphamFan said:

I am talking about the use of the term precisely by Naawaz, Ayaan Hirsi Ali et al. The "Left" which supports Neoliberalist trade policies, alliance with Saudi Barbaria and calls censure of Salafism "Islamophobia".

Malcolm wrote:

But it is islamaphobia. Salafism, like Calvinism, is a collection of bad ideas. But the censure of bad ideas never eradicates them. Instead, it just reinforces them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 7:48 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

French Canada

Queequeg said:

Je me souviens.

Why were they fighting with the Americans? Were they expecting independence, too?

Malcolm wrote:

They were enemies of the British Empire.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

Queequeg said:

Meaning, we kicked those bastards to the curb by 1783. (No offense, I love you Brits, with your warm beer and crooked teeth.)

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually, they just got tired of subsidizing us and gave up. We did not kick anyone to the curb.

Queequeg said:

Will you stop it? You're like the evil uncle at the four year old's birthday party, popping all the balloons.

Malcolm wrote:

It is even worse, 85 percent of the colonial troops under Washington were from the New England states, with the rest coming from French Canada, and a few stragglers from here and there. Most people from New York south, were very content under British rule.

But we yankees were such a pain in the ass, they eventually allowed us to "win" and

went home.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 3:31 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

Queequeg said:

Meaning, we kicked those bastards to the curb by 1783. (No offense, I love you Brits, with your warm beer and crooked teeth.)

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually, they just got tired of subsidizing us and gave up. We did not kick anyone to the curb.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The best way to protect Western Liberal Values is to practice them, and accept the risks our open society entails, including protecting the rights of freedom of religion for everyone, including Muslims, fundamentalist or otherwise, and Christians, fundamentalist or otherwise.

Rakz said:

This kind of soft attitude has worked well for Europe. Far right nationalists are now more popular than ever before. What do you think is responsible for that?

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a soft attitude. It is just a harder standard to maintain since people actually have to live according to their Western Liberal Values rather than merely giving them lip service.

Rakz said:

Our WLVs are not protected by withdrawing into nationalist shells, and in fact that impulse towards nationalism inevitably results in tyrannies, as history shows. Trump is just the latest of the wannabe tyrants. And tyrants, we should all recall, only rise to power because of popular acclaim.

You may see him as a tyrant. I see him as a strong, masculine leader who deeply cares for his country. WLVs will not decline but flourish under his administration.

Malcolm wrote:

He is a pampered sissy. About as tough as a Pomeranian.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 3:23 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

Admin_PC said:

British are typically implied.

Queequeg said:

Brits have nothing to do with White Culture.

Admin_PC said:

I have no clue what you're on about here, but southern US culture (especially on the plantations) is VERY heavily influenced by British culture.

Queequeg said:

Not really limited to the NorthEast.

There are no WASPS who would accept association with that Hilly Billy White Trash sh*t. Those people look down on everybody.

Admin_PC said:

Not the sum-total of "white" culture, nor were the "Hilly Billy"s at the forefront of racial segregation in the south. "Hillbillies" are actually associated with the Appalachians & the Ozarks rather than with the deep south. Think "Hatfield and McCoys" versus "Gone with the Wind". The later culture was more responsible for organizations like the KKK, while the former were more rural outsiders.

Malcolm wrote:

Not sure that this has to do with alt-right racist dipshits...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

Rakz said:

I don't agree with many things that the alt right speak of but I support them in stopping Islamization (which has led to the rapid decline of Europe) and protecting western liberal values.

Malcolm wrote:

The best way to protect Western Liberal Values is to practice them, and accept the risks our open society entails, including protecting the rights of freedom of religion for everyone, including Muslims, fundamentalist or otherwise, and Christians, fundamentalist or otherwise. Our WLVs are not protected by withdrawing into

nationalist shells, and in fact that impulse towards nationalism inevitably results in tyrannies, as history shows. Trump is just the latest of the wannabe tyrants. And tyrants, we should all recall, only rise to power because of popular acclaim.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 2:24 AM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Queequeg said:

He criticizes Shingon because Mahāvairocana is disembodied Dharmakaya.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a false criticism, because Mahāvairocana is the nature of the five elements and is present through their presence in everyone and everything. In Shingon, the dharmakāya is imminent in all phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

WASP said:

White Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP) is an informal, sometimes disparaging term[1] for a group of high-status and influential White Americans of English Protestant ancestry. The term applies to a group who control disproportionate financial, political and social power in the United States.

Malcolm wrote:

Mostly in the northeast, as that is where most of the money is in the US.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: I am the Father of this world

Content:

Queequeg said:

I actually agree with the gist of what you are saying. I find it mistaken when people take these passages and reduce Buddha to some sort of Creator God by emphasizing "father" in a biological sense. Seems to me, the correct meaning should be taken as "I am like the father of all beings." I've always understood this statement as referring to the ideal of the father as contrasted with the ideal of the mother. Mother is loving, nurturing, compassionate; Father is the guide to what is correct and proper; the ideal of upright

conduct; the protector.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I agree. The idea of Pitṛ Brahma, Brahma the ancestor, is indeed the idea of a progenitor; but like virtually all these brahmanical references, the Buddha and Buddhists reinterpreted them morally and socially since they did not take them literally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

Queequeg said:

I'

Admin_PC said:

Originally associated with WASPs (which Scotch-Irish are not), and then has grown from there. The newest trend is to lump non-black latinos into "white" culture as well.

Queequeg said:

WASPS means... Anglos in the NorthEast. .

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

MiphamFan said:

The Regressive Left is just as much a problem that hasn't been pointed out in mainstream media.

Malcolm wrote:

Um, no. The term has become a right wing buzzword divorced from its origins:

http://rationalwiki.org/wiki/Regressive_left

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: I am the Father of this world

Content:

Queequeg said:

The contexts in which these titles appear suggests that the paternal relationship is

literal. Can you address that?

Malcolm wrote:

I did. In this context "father of the world", an epithet of Brahma, simply means "teacher of the world," and nothing more. Disciples are regularly referred to as children in Buddhist texts.

Queequeg said:

Not convinced. Neither am I disagreeing. There is, quite literally, more to it in this context and you haven't addressed the significance that these statements appear in the context of parables about fathers saving their children.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, lets look again at what the Sanskrit for that passage is:

emeva haṃ śārisutā maharṣī

sattvāna trāṇaṃ ca pitā ca bhumiḥ

putrāśca te prāṇina sarvi mahyaṃ

Śariputra, I, the great rishi,
am the protector (trāṇaṃ), the father (pitā) and the support (bhumi) for all sentient beings,

all those creatures are my children.

This shows a paternal relation, but it shows only that. And India, a guru was more important than your father, so the language of the father guru, the pitrguru, is very common.

The prodigal son parable is very compelling, but it is not original.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Why is Amitabha absent in American Zen and TB?

Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:

Amitabha...

Malcolm wrote:

Is a huge practice among Kagyus and Nyingmapas.

Oṃ Amidevi hriḥ is a very common mantra.

Monlam Tharchin said:

Why do you suppose then that in the months I attended at the local Kagyu center, Amitabha was not mentioned once in dharma talks, questions, chants, or in the day-

long retreats?

Is it not considered suitable for a general audience?

Malcolm wrote:

Probably because Amitabha practice is a separate cycle, and not every center will focus on it. But for example, it is a very popular practice at KTD. And also, the longevity form of Amitabha, Amitayus, is also extremely popular, and many Tibetan Buddhists recite either one or both of these mantras daily.

There is also the practice of the transference of consciousness, and in 90 percent of such practices, the goal of transference is Sukhavati, and Amitabha is the main object of visualization.

So in fact, Amitabha is extremely important in all schools of Tibetan Buddhism, in one way or another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

boda said:

What exactly is "white culture" in the U.S.? And genetically, there isn't much difference to begin with, aside from the racial mixing that's been going on for some time.

Queequeg said:

I suspect the people who talk about White Culture mean the culture of people descended from the Scotch-Irish, which people like Pat Buchanan claim is the largest minority in the U.S.

Malcolm wrote:

White culture:

```
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: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: I am the Father of this world

Content:

Queequeg said:

The contexts in which these titles appear suggests that the paternal relationship is

literal. Can you address that?

Malcolm wrote:

I did. In this context "father of the world", an epithet of Brahma, simply means "teacher of the world," and nothing more. Disciples are regularly referred to as children in Buddhist texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 24th, 2016 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: Why is Amitabha absent in American Zen and TB?

Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:

Amitabha...

Malcolm wrote:

Is a huge practice among Kagyus and Nyingmapas.

Oṃ Amidevi hriḥ is a very common mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2016 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: I am the Father of this world

Content:

Queequeg said:

Is it simply a matter of adopting one of Brahma's titles? Immediately before this he relates the story of the physician who finds his children drank poison and became deranged.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that in fact is how Indians reading this text would understand it. Vasubandhu's commentary understands "father" (pitr) to mean teacher, thus it would read in his rendition, "I am the self-originated teacher (ācarya) of the world."

I know there is a great deal of resistance among Sinosphere Buddhists to accept that Indian Buddhists actually understood their own texts, but there is it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2016 at 9:43 PM

Title: Re: The "Alt-Right" is a legitimate problem

Content:

DGA said:

the alt-right or "alternative right" is an increasingly mainstreamed political movement that has been touched on topically in the media but is, in my opinion, underestimated in its reach and its stench. This is a highly problematic situation.

...

Elsewhere I said that Trump represents a toxic, poisonous strain in US culture. I mean it: this is ignorance, hatred, and greed all crystallized into one nutty mess. Russia thinks its great, though.

Malcolm wrote:

The man is a fascist, as are many of his followers. The rest of them are just blind.

Wiemar, 1933 all over again.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2016 at 10:41 AM

Title: Re: I am the Father of this world

Content:

Coëmgenu said:

What is your interpretation of this famous line from Chapter 16 of the Lotus Sutra?

"I am the Father of this world."

Malcolm wrote:

I'd want to see the original text.

Coëmgenu said:

An orthodox answer that will be readily accepted by most Buddhists who don't excessively venerate the Lotus Sutra will be that he is saying he is the "Father" of his Pure Land. But I was more looking for personal responses.

I'm on a cell phone so I can't readily copy and paste, but I'll link you to the <http://www.nichirenlibrary.org/en/lsoc/Content/16>. It appears in the verse-section near the end.

Malcolm wrote:

It's ok, the epithet is in Sanskrit:

yameva haṃ lokapitā svayaṃbhūḥ

cikitsakaḥ sarvaprajāna nāthaḥ|

"Lokapitā" is a title of Brahma, as is svayaṃbhūḥ, cikitsakaḥ, etc. Buddha frequently adopts the titles of Brahma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2016 at 10:23 AM

Title: Re: I am the Father of this world

Content:

Coëmgenu said:

What is your interpretation of this famous line from Chapter 16 of the Lotus Sutra?

"I am the Father of this world."

Malcolm wrote:

I'd want to see the original text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2016 at 10:22 AM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Queequeg said:

That is a labored task.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, it is pretty obvious. Then there is the well known phenomena of light skinned African Americans skipping over the color barrier.

Queequeg said:

Yeah, race is a big complicated issue in America... unless of course you want to cram it down into your personally acceptable categories. Which is just more complication of race.

Go figure.

Malcolm wrote:

This is why nationalism is bullshit:

Genetic tracing suggests this initial migratory pulse out of Africa happened around 72,000 years ago. The ancestors of indigenous Australians and Papuans split from this pioneering group around 58,000 years ago as they continued to make their eastward journey. (By comparison, European and Asian ancestral groups diverged around 42,000 years ago.)

https://gizmodo.com/aboriginal-australians-are-humanity-s-oldest-civilizati-1786940046?utm_campaign=socialflow_io9_facebook&utm_source=io9_facebook&utm_medium=socialflow

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2016 at 9:51 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Queequeg said:

-Andrew Jackson

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, another fine Indian killer and slave owner. Trump would fit right in with that lot.

The Cicada said:

It isn't fair to hold Jackson up to present standards.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is, just as it is fair to hold up Stalin, Hitler and Mao to modern standards.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2016 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Queequeg said:

Can you break this down a little?

What is meant by "gathering accumulations"?

Malcolm wrote:

Gathering accumulations means gather the accumulations of merit and pristine consciousness.

Queequeg said:

What is "time of being"?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no difference between when there was full awakening and the remainder of the career of the a buddha since there is no time in the immaculate dhātu at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2016 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Queequeg said:

We identify the Primordial Buddha as Shakyamuni because that is how the Primordial Buddha last appeared in the form of a Buddha in the Saha World.

Malcolm wrote:
This is debatable.

The last time the "primordial buddha" appeared in this world system was in the person of nirmanakāya Garab Dorje. Prior to Garab Dorje, Śakyamuni appeared, prior to him, Abhisambodharāja, and prior to him, Buddha Kashyapa, and so on.

Queequeg said:
Some Nichiren Buddhists think Nichiren was such a Nirmanakaya. This is not a consensus view at all.

I dig the pointing finger.

Malcolm wrote:
Nichiren as nirmanakāya is a later view. Garab Dorje as a nirmanakāya is stated at the beginning of the tradition by himself. But the latter is not important here in this forum.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2016 at 1:41 AM
Title: Re: Primordial Buddha
Content:

Queequeg said:
We identify the Primordial Buddha as Shakyamuni because that is how the Primordial Buddha last appeared in the form of a Buddha in the Saha World.

Malcolm wrote:
This is debatable.

The last time the "primordial buddha" appeared in this world system was in the person of nirmanakāya Garab Dorje. Prior to Garab Dorje, Śakyamuni appeared, prior to him, Abhisambodharāja, and prior to him, Buddha Kashyapa, and so on.

However, this is not the important point. The important point is what ādibuddha actually means. Candrakīrti's explanation is perfect:

As for the ādibuddha, some claim it does exist because a buddhahood without gathering accumulations is not reasonable; if there is no other buddha, the gathering accumulations itself is not reasonable; and because of beginninglessness, a single buddha is also not reasonable. Also many buddhas are not asserted because the dharmakāya is undifferentiated within the immaculate dhātu. Therefore, from the perspective of the dharmakāya, the time of full awakening and the time of being are not at odds. Therefore, from the perspective of the dharmakāya, it is also reasonable to present an ādibuddha, because ultimate nature of the dharmakāya is single."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2016 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Queequeg said:

So are you saying that Abhidharmakosa itself is the root teaching on which all else depends? Or more specifically, this teaching on the arising and destruction of the worlds is the Root Gate?

Malcolm wrote:

It is the book in which all the foundational ideas of Sanskritized Buddhism are found, common to both Hinayāna and Mahāyāna. For example, without reading the Kośa and its commentary, it is very difficult to make heads or tails of the Mulamadhyamaka karikas, not to mention Yogācāra and Vajrayāna.

Queequeg said:

So, "Foundation" is different from "Root".

Malcolm wrote:

It is something like the anatomy and physiology of Dharma and its paths.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2016 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In this case it is a translation of ādibuddha.

Coëmgenu said:

I don't know what the English word "Primordial" is a translation of, but Primordial does not just mean "first". It also means "fundamental" or "basic", or even "foundational".

Queequeg said:

The term "Primordial Buddha" is this: 本佛. The character translated as "Primordial" is 本.

本 has a wide range of meanings - From the Digital Dictionary of Buddhism

Basic Meaning: root

Senses:

Source, origin, essence, basis. To be rooted in, to find the origin in (Skt. upādāya; Tib.

nye bar bzung nas). The Sanskrit mūla, pūrva, ādi ('root') is transliterated as 慕攞. (Skt. prakṛti; grantha; atyanta, ākara, aditas, uddeśa, eva, jātiya, dravya, nityam, purā, purāṇa, puri, purima, pure, pūrvaka, pūrva-kāla, pūrva-prahīṇa, pūrvam, pūrvānta, pūrvika, paurāṇa, paurāṇaka, paurvika, prakṛtyā, pradhāna, bimba, bhāva, mūla-yoni, maula, yoni, samam, saṃbhava, sarvathā, sva) [Charles Muller; source(s): Nakamura, YBh-Ind, Hirakawa]

In Buddhist texts, often found in such compound words as 'original nature' 本性, 'original enlightenment' 本覺, or 'original Buddhahood' 本佛, indicating the human mind which is in essence undefiled and enlightened. [Charles Muller]

Radical, fundamental, original, principal, one's own; the Buddha himself, contrasted with 蹟, traces left by him among men to educate them; also a volume of a book. [Charles Muller; source(s): Soothill]

Book, document. [Charles Muller]

Early Middle Chinese (Pulleyblank 1991, p. 31): 'Originally, in its origin' ; 'once,' past tense Adverbial use: sentential adverb, following the subject: 'originally,' derived from the nominal meaning 'origin, source' . Classical, Han period Chinese, Buddhist literature. [Barbara Meisterernst]

Aspecto-temporal adverb in the Buddhist literature: preceding the verb, i.e. in the syntactic position typical for aspecto-temporal adverbs (following modal adverbs, but preceding prepositional phrases and manner adverbs): 'past tense,' 'once' . In this position similar to céng 曾. [Barbara Meisterernst]

'Etiology' of a disease, as in the compound 病本 [Robert Buswell]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2016 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Queequeg said:

But there are more direct teachings, aren't there? Why go all roundabout?

Malcolm wrote:

All good houses need solid foundations.

Queequeg said:

So are you saying that Abhidharmakosa itself is the root teaching on which all else depends? Or more specifically, this teaching on the arising and destruction of the worlds is the Root Gate?

Malcolm wrote:

It is the book in which all the foundational ideas of Sanskritized Buddhism are found, common to both Hinayāna and Mahāyāna. For example, without reading the Kośa and its commentary, it is very difficult to make heads or tails of the Mulamadhyamaka karikas, not to mention Yogācāra and Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2016 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Coëmgenu said:

Buddhism exists in history. What is the history of the Primordial Buddha? We have a foretaste in the older tradition, but not the fullness.

Malcolm wrote:

There are plenty of ahistorical innovations in Buddhadharma. And for example, Candrakīrti explicitly offers a qualified negation of the idea of an adibuddha, along the lines of what I explained above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 23rd, 2016 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Minobu said:

so what exactly are your views on this Primordial Buddha , i think it is a misnomer when placed before a Being.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no primordial buddha, since there was never a beginning. However, there have always been the three kāyas, since they too are without beginning and there is only one dharmakāya of the buddhas. So, we can say euphemistically that the dharmakāya is the primordial buddha in the sense that the dharmakāya is the nature of reality to be realized, and whether it is realized or not, reality is always there to be realized.

Coëmgenu said:

I don't know what the English word "Primordial" is a translation of, but Primordial does not just mean "first". It also means "fundamental" or "basic", or even "foundational".

There are three pieces of scripture, which are just scripture I know, but they shed some more light on this issue, at least from a historical perspective: Now, the Blessed One has said, "Whoever sees dependent co-arising sees the Dhamma; whoever sees the Dhamma sees dependent co-arising."

(MN 28 in the Pali Canon) Enough Vakkali! Why do you want to see this foul body? One who sees the Dhamma sees me; one who sees me sees the Dhamma. For in seeing the

dhamma, Vakkali, one sees me; and in seeing me one sees the Dhamma.
(SN 22.87 in the Pali Canon again)

Not having a good handle on Chinese, I have little access to the āgamas, it is possible these quotes have parallels there. Nonetheless I found these quotes somewhat foundational for the Primordial Buddha discourse.

Malcolm wrote:

The Hinayāna dharmakāya as the doctrine of the Buddha does not really apply. Basically, this discussion is around the Nichirin identification of Buddha Śakyamuni as being the adibuddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Minobu said:

I've always respected your views. Have read you for years here .

As per 3 Kayas. How can there be a Nirmanakaya Body when there was a time when it was impossible due to the absence of sentient vessels/bodies in this realm.

[/qupte]

There are infinite realms, therefore, there are infinite opportunities for the nirmanakāya to manifest.

Also do you feel like your slumming in this section...that might sound really sadisticly sarcastic and caustic but hey...I've no filters when it comes to social situations.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. But I do watch people get hopelessly tangled up in quasi theistic ideas all the time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Too hilarious:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/video/2016/sep/22/the-dalai-lama-does-his-donald-trump-impression-video?>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 10:40 PM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Queequeg said:

But there are more direct teachings, aren't there? Why go all roundabout?

Malcolm wrote:

All good houses need solid foundations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Queequeg said:

-Andrew Jackson

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, another fine Indian killer and slave owner. Trump would fit right in with that lot.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Minobu said:

so what exactly are your views on this Primordial Buddha , i think it is a misnomer when placed before a Being.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no primordial buddha, since there was never a beginning. However, there have always been the three kāyas, since they too are without beginning and there is only one dharmakāya of the buddhas. So, we can say euphemistically that the dharmakāya is the primordial buddha in the sense that the dharmakāya is the nature of reality to be realized, and whether it is realized or not, reality is always there to be realized.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

You were just arguing tulkus were not literal reincarnations, which I agree with.

Sherab Dorje said:

Actually, in regards to ChNN's son, he just argued that he is a literal reincarnation.

Malcolm wrote:

I stated that ChNN believes it is so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 9:00 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Then why did he want his son to go to the monastery he is the tulku of?

Malcolm wrote:

He has genuine confidence in his son being the incarnation of his uncle. But that does not mean he has confidence in all, or even most, reincarnations.

BuddhaFollower said:

You were just arguing tulkus were not literal reincarnations, which I agree with.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I was not arguing that. Some tulkus, like ChNN are reincarnations of the people they were recognized as. But not very many.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Queequeg said:

I'm not sure your point... so contemplating on the destruction of the world as set forth in Abhidarmakosa is the right guide for contemplation?

I find as the years go by, I'm less and less imaginative. I don't see any benefit at this stage in contemplating the origin of the universe. I could die this afternoon, and thinking about beings in the 4th dhyana at the destruction of the universe sounds like a wasted

session on the cushion.

Malcolm wrote:

If you understand the sequence of how the universe arises and perishes, you are in a much better position to understand what happens to you when you die. It's basically the same process.

Queequeg said:

But there are more direct teachings, aren't there? Why go all roundabout?

Malcolm wrote:

Let me know when your buddhahood is not just an intellectual theory about interpenetration of realms...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Queequeg said:

This approach strikes me as too literal, scholastic, theoretical. Guides contemplation off course.

Malcolm wrote:

Studying texts like the Kośa, and tenet systems in general is meant to eliminate concepts by introducing one to mistaken points of view. I regularly see participants on Buddhist boards engaging in all kinds of fantasies because they have not properly trained their minds in tenet systems. So they often have no idea what they are talking about since many of us here are uneducated dummies when it comes to Buddhadharma.

On the other hand, this is religion, so people can believe whatever the hell they like.

Queequeg said:

I'm not sure your point... so contemplating on the destruction of the world as set forth in Abhidarmakosa is the right guide for contemplation?

I find as the years go by, I'm less and less imaginative. I don't see any benefit at this stage in contemplating the origin of the universe. I could die this afternoon, and thinking about beings in the 4th dhyana at the destruction of the universe sounds like a wasted session on the cushion.

Malcolm wrote:

If you understand the sequence of how the universe arises and perishes, you are in a much better position to understand what happens to you when you die. It's basically the

same process.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 4:17 AM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Queequeg said:

Malcolm, you're going to have to circulate an appendix with a list of recognized and permissible categories. The memo didn't get around.

Malcolm wrote:

Nationalism, whether American or any other kind, is bullshit. American Nationalism, in particular, is bullshit, since the "American Dream" is built on a foundation of ethnic cleansing, genocide and human trafficking.

Queequeg said:

Yeah, we've been over this already.

Malcolm 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: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I gave you a reference in a book so you could decide for yourself how to understand these things. I did not tell you to go off and ask Orgyen Tenzin how to understand these things.

Sherab Dorje said:

The book is written by a Tibetan lama too, yah know?

Malcolm wrote:

I mentioned that book in order that you could discover the substance of the six points since I do not have time to translate Lhatsun's book at the present time. It is not a high priority for me. Read or don't read it --- it really depends on how much you want to know about Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Queequeg said:

This approach strikes me as too literal, scholastic, theoretical. Guides contemplation off course.

Malcolm wrote:

Studying texts like the Kośa, and tenet systems in general is meant to eliminate concepts by introducing one to mistaken points of view. I regularly see participants on Buddhist boards engaging in all kinds of fantasies because they have not properly trained their minds in tenet systems. So they often have no idea what they are talking about since many of us here are uneducated dummies when it comes to Buddhadharma.

On the other hand, this is religion, so people can believe whatever the hell they like.

Queequeg said:

Come, Kālāmas, do not go by oral tradition, by lineage of teaching, by hearsay, by a collection of scriptures, by logical reasoning, by inferential reasoning, by reasoned cogitation, by the acceptance of a view after pondering it, by the seeming competence of a speaker, or because you think: 'The ascetic is our guru.' But when you know for yourselves: 'These things are wholesome; these things are blameless; these things are praised by the wise; these things, if accepted and undertaken, lead to welfare and happiness,' then you should live in accordance with them.

Malcolm wrote:

The Kalamas people were non-Buddhists, who by the end of the sūtra, convert to Buddhism.

"Marvelous, venerable sir! Marvelous, venerable sir! As if, venerable sir, a person were to turn face upward what is upside down, or to uncover the concealed, or to point the way to one who is lost or to carry a lamp in the darkness, thinking, 'Those who have eyes will see visible objects,' so has the Dhamma been set forth in many ways by the Blessed One. We, venerable sir, go to the Blessed One for refuge, to the Dhamma for refuge, and to the Community of Bhikkhus for refuge. Venerable sir, may the Blessed One regard us as lay followers who have gone for refuge for life, from today."

Significantly, this sūtra merely shows a form of boosterism for the Buddha. It should be balanced with this from the Eastern Gatehouse Sutta:

"Excellent, Sariputta. Excellent. Those who have not known, seen, penetrated, realized, or attained it by means of discernment would have to take it on conviction in others that the faculty of conviction... persistence... mindfulness... concentration... discernment, when developed & pursued, gains a footing in the Deathless, has the Deathless as its goal & consummation; whereas those who have known, seen, penetrated, realized, &

attained it by means of discernment would have no doubt or uncertainty that the faculty of conviction... persistence... mindfulness... concentration... discernment, when developed & pursued, gains a footing in the Deathless, has the Deathless as its goal & consummation."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 4:02 AM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Where do you make a concrete distinction between say, one promoting one's culture and it's perceived values (for instance, as Tibetans and others do), and Nationalism?

Malcolm wrote:

Not a big fan of Tibetan nationalism. It too is built on a tissue of historical fallacies and their own version of ethnic cleansing (in case any one ever wondered what happened to Zhang Zhung...)

Johnny Dangerous said:

Saying that all nationalism/patriotism is bullshit is not satisfactory answer to me,

Malcolm wrote:

That's ok. I still insist that nationalism, and patriotism, is bullshit.

Johnny Dangerous said:

...simply saying it's all bullshit requires one to then say that people should organize based on something other than a perceived shared culture, ethnicity, shared values etc.

Malcolm wrote:

How about a shared planet which is the only one we can reach (since we live on it) capable of sustaining human life, not to mention all other forms of life we presently know of.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nationalism is bullshit, in any form.

Queequeg said:

Malcolm, you're going to have to circulate an appendix with a list of recognized and

permissible categories. The memo didn't get around.

Malcolm wrote:

Nationalism, whether American or any other kind, is bullshit. American Nationalism, in particular, is bullshit, since the "American Dream" is built on a foundation of ethnic cleansing, genocide and human trafficking.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Queequeg said:

This points to American Nationalism being something fundamentally different than say, nationalism in the UK, or Germany, or Ukraine, or Russia, or whatever. Race or culture or religion does not matter to most of us as much as fundamental commitment to certain ideals, to a certain social contract.

The moment American nationalism becomes racial, I think it loses its meaning.

Malcolm wrote:

Nationalism is bullshit, in any form.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The aggregates of an arhat are not transformed because they have not realized dharmakāya.

maybay said:

I thought it was the rupakaya they don't realize?

Malcolm wrote:

They also do not realize the dharmakāya since they do not realize two fold emptiness, not to mention they do not realize emptiness free from all extremes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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?

Malcolm wrote:

He has genuine confidence in his son being the incarnation of his uncle. But that does not mean he has confidence in all, or even most, reincarnations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This says volumes, then of course there is Sthiramati's commentary on this work.

Astus said:

Does it? Sounds like the same argument used before.

Malcolm wrote:

Your qualms are clearly not going to be resolved without reading several hundred pages of detailed analysis. That won't happen here. So learn Tibetan or Chinese and do the reading yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

and Gayley says that Dudjom Rinpoche was the body emanation (sku sprul). Does anyone know what the deal is?

Malcolm wrote:

Quite honestly, is it very important at all?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN has zero confidence in the tulku system, as a whole. He has mentioned this quite often.

Sherab Dorje said:

I wasn't talking about the tulku "system" I was talking about the fact that he is a tulku.

Does he also doubt that he is a tulku?

Malcolm wrote:

He certainly did, for many, many years. And I am quite certain if you asked him if he were the same person as Adzom Drugpa, he would look at you very strangely. But you can try.

Sherab Dorje said:

In any respect, I am perfectly capable of deciding for myself how to understand these things without needing to run to a Tibetan lama every time someone else has doubts. So, what's good for the goose is not good for the gander, coz 5 posts ago...

I will be chasing down the Big Red Book nonetheless, thanks for recommending it!

Malcolm wrote:

I gave you a reference in a book so you could decide for yourself how to understand these things. I did not tell you to go off and ask Orgyen Tenzin how to understand these things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely the view that they are not the same persons is correct since we do not believe, in Buddhism, in the continuity of personhood at all. If we do, we are making a mistake.

Sherab Dorje said:

Sure. But this means that there is not "this person" either. And yet here "I" am bugging the crap out of "you".

Anyway, you don't have to take my word on the matter, why don't you go ask your teacher? He's a tulku after all. I am 100% sure he knows a lot more than me about the issue. Or his son. He's also a tulku, isn't he?

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN has zero confidence in the tulku system, as a whole. He has mentioned this quite often. In any respect, I am perfectly capable of deciding for myself how to understand these things without needing to run to a Tibetan lama every time someone else has doubts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 22nd, 2016 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Arhats have an inferior conversion, according to Asanga, because arhats are afraid of transmigration and reject it since their realization of emptiness is confined to the selflessness of the person.

Astus said:

The Samgraha says nothing new on the matter, just that arhats know only personal emptiness while bodhisattvas the dual emptiness. It does not really discuss the aggregates in relation to the arhats. So, I don't think that work is of much help here.

"This conversion of support has six varieties: ... 5) inferior conversion— the realization by word-hearers of the non-self of persons, which completely turns away from transmigration and constitutes an eternal rejection of transmigration;

Malcolm wrote:

This says volumes, then of course there is Sthiramati's commentary on this work.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Do I have to meditate to be a Buddhist?

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

It's also impossible to experience a direct realisation of emptiness without practising formal sitting meditation on it because it is a very subtle object and we need powerful concentration and wisdom developed in formal meditation to realise it directly.

Malcolm wrote:

This isn't true.

Tsongkhapafan said:

I'm afraid it is.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it really isn't true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Queequeg said:

That is a labored task.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, it is pretty obvious. Then there is the well known phenomena of light skinned African Americans skipping over the color barrier.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That is what you might believe. I am comfortable with the idea of reincarnations (whether tertons or not) of being very separate persons from their predecessors. And, Dudjom Lingpa had more than one incarnation.

Sherab Dorje said:

So? Jamyang Khyentse Wangpo has five types of emanations, with more than one in emanation of some of the categories.

Sku

Dzongsar Khyentse Jamyang Chökyi Wangpo (1894?-1909)

Gsung

Karma Khyentse'i Ozer (1896–1945)

Second Beru Khyentse (Beru or Palpung Khyentse) (1946-)

Thugs

Sakya Punpo Khyentse (1900–1950)

Dilgo Khyentse Rabsal Dawa (1910–1991)

Se Phagchog Dorje (1854–1919), a son of Togden Shakya Sri

Yon tan

Dzogchen Khyentse Guru Tsewang (c.1897-c.1945)

Nangchen Khyentse Kunzang Drodul (1897-1946)

Phrin las

Katog Khyentse Jamyang Chökyi Lodro (1893–1959), later known as Dzongsar Khyentse Jamyang Chökyi Lodro

Like you don't have a problem considering them separate persons I don't have a problem considering them the same. Now who's view is correct is a point of contention that I am not really all that interested in.

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely the view that they are not the same persons is correct since we do not believe, in Buddhism, in the continuity of personhood at all. If we do, we are making a mistake.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: Primordial Buddha

Content:

Queequeg said:

This approach strikes me as too literal, scholastic, theoretical. Guides contemplation off course.

Malcolm wrote:

Studying texts like the Kośa, and tenet systems in general is meant to eliminate concepts by introducing one to mistaken points of view. I regularly see participants on Buddhist boards engaging in all kinds of fantasies because they have not properly trained their minds in tenet systems. So they often have no idea what they are talking about since many of us here are uneducated dummies when it comes to Buddhadharma.

On the other hand, this is religion, so people can believe whatever the hell they like.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 10:40 PM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Queequeg said:

Astus, see the first post in this thread.

I specifically addressed race or culture as basis for national identity and offered the American version as alternative.

Malcolm wrote:

Unfortunately, the trend in America is to attempt to become "white" (look at how Italians, Irish, Jews, etc., were excluded from being considered white until the sixties). Therefore, with Trump we have a white, fascist nationalism that is on the rise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The aggregates of an arhat are not transformed because they have not realized dharmakāya.

The buddhas do not have cetana, because of the transformation of the samskara skandha.

Astus said:

So there are the upadana-skandhas, the anupadana-skandhas, and what is the third version?

Malcolm wrote:

Arhats have an inferior conversion, according to Asanga, because arhats are afraid of transmigration and reject it since their realization of emptiness is confined to the

selflessness of the person.

You should read the Mahāyāna Saṃgraha before resuming this discussion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Anupadāna-skandhas are the transformed aggregates.

Astus said:

That's what arhats have. How is there any difference then between arhats and buddhas in terms of the aggregates?

Arhats may be without craving, but they still have cetana.

Since even buddhas can be described by aggregates without attachment, they have cetana too. Furthermore, cetana is a universal mental factor, necessary for any mental function.

Malcolm wrote:

The aggregates of an arhat are not transformed because they have not realized dharmakāya.

The buddhas do not have cetana, because of the transformation of the saṃskara skandha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Btw, would say that Berzin is actually fairly kosher in his elucidation of rigpa's permanence expressed here:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know. Vidyā is equated with vipaśyāna and knowledge in the old commentaries.

The more I study and translate the older layers of man ngag sde commentaries, the more I understand how much improvement there needs to be in how we translate things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 9:02 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, yes. Dudjom Lingpa passed away in 1904. Dudjom Rinpoche was born in 1904.

Sherab Dorje said:

If you believe in reincarnation and tertons, then it is the continuation of the same mindstream. So I do not differentiate between the two.

Malcolm wrote:

That is what you might believe. I am comfortable with the idea of reincarnations (whether tertons or not) of being very separate persons from their predecessors. And, Dudjom Lingpa had more than one incarnation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Illuminating Quotes by Malcolm Namdrol-la

Content:

Kim said:

Wonderful. In which traditions? Given by who?

Malcolm wrote:

I completed a three year solitary retreat of mixed Sakya and Nyingma practices, between 1993 and 1997.

.

TaTa said:

May i ask where did you do the retreat? Im looking for ideas. Thanks

Malcolm wrote:

In Central MA, but the place, literally, no longer exists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 5:48 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No one accepts that afflictions are a precondition for the arising of the mind, if one does, it renders the Pabhassara Sutta meaningless.

Astus said:

If that were the case, then no school could posit the disperse of the aggregates following parinirvana of the arhat. And that contradicts the accusation of the Hinayana schools' annihilationist view.

Malcolm wrote:

"Break up of the aggregates" generally refers to the separation of mind and body. But it does not mean that some Hinayāna schools did not posit that the "breakup of the aggregates" meant the utter cessation of the five aggregates altogether.

Astus said:

He just means upadana skandhas. For example, it well known that the mental aggregate transforms into the four pristine consciousness according to the Mahayānasamgraha. If aggregates without attachment may continue, then there is no point in their transformation, nor in changing vijñāna into jñāna.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a silly response. Anupadāna-skandhas are the transformed aggregates.

Astus said:

And nevertheless the Buddha has five aggregates.
Aren't they supposed to change into the four/five wisdoms?

Malcolm wrote:

Don't be so lazy, Astus. It is only the mental aggregate that transforms into the four pristine consciousnesses.

Astus said:

Arhats are supposed to be without all kinds of craving. And craving for existence (bhavatanha) or non-existence (vibhavatanha) are two basic types of desire.

Malcolm wrote:

Arhats may be without craving, but they still have cetana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Therefore, you are asserting that afflictions are a necessary precondition for the arising of the mind, period.

Astus said:

And apparently so does everyone else who accept the twelve nidanas as Buddhadharma.

Malcolm wrote:

No one accepts that afflictions are a precondition for the arising of the mind, if one does, it renders the Pabhassara Sutta meaningless.

Astus said:

Even the Uttaratantra states:

"It is true happiness, since [even] the aggregates of mental nature and their causes are reversed."

(v 38)

And DJKR comments:

"The dharmakaya has no aggregates, not even the subtlest aggregates, nor the cause of such aggregates, which is ignorance. When there is no ignorance and no result of ignorance, namely the aggregates, there is no suffering. That is transcendental bliss."
(p 46-47)

Malcolm wrote:

He just means upadana skandhas. For example, it well known that the mental aggregate transforms into the four pristine consciousness according to the Mahayānasamgraha: Buddhas are beyond the aggregates, but also they enter the aggregates; neither different from them nor the same, without abandoning them, they are well beyond the aggregates. This should put to rest any idea that the buddhas lack aggregates.

Astus said:

So you think buddhas are pieces of wood, inert, like rocks.

As the Uttaratantra states, they make no effort, and all activities are illusory.

"Here the meaning of the chapter is as follows:

The nine aspects of physical display and so on [show] that the Teacher has no birth and death, and yet perfectly manifests without any effort.

Something that, similar to Indra, the drum, clouds, Brahma, the sun, the precious king of wish-granting gems, an echo, space, and the earth, effortlessly and as long as existence may last fulfils others' benefit is only conceived of by [supreme] yogis."

(v 363-364)

Malcolm wrote:

And nevertheless the Buddha has five aggregates.

Astus said:

When vijñana loses the two obscurations and only jñana remains, what is it that maintains the continuity? If you say it's the aspirations, then those vows were added to vijñana and the continuity is not the result of the absence of defilements.

Malcolm wrote:

I mentioned before that these aspirations are praṇidhānapāramitā. As such, since they are made free of the three wheels, they are an inexhaustible cause.

In the case of an arhat, what sustains their consciousness until they are aroused from the slumber of the samadhi of cessation is their intention to enter that samadhi.

Astus said:

Buddhahood is a supramundane jñana.

And what does that actually mean?

Malcolm wrote:

Supposedly you are an ācarya. I trust you can figure it out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that there is a hard distinction between conditioned and unconditioned phenomena is a form of realism. The Dzogchen point of view is best, IMO:

It may be said, "The way all this is produced is dependent origination, arising and ceasing."

Like a burnt seed, a nonexistent is not produced from a nonexistent; the cause and the result do not exist.

The mind that clings to entities and clings to cause and result

itself appears as cause and condition, but because they are nondual, there is no arising and perishing.

Because there is no arising and perishing, there is no self and other. Because there is no death and transmigration, there is no permanence and annihilation.

Therefore there is no delusion or samsara. In fact, there is also no nirvana.

-- Mañjuśrīmitra.

treehuggingoctopus said:

Thanks. Isn't that at times the meaning of unconditioned when the term is used in (some translations of) Dzogchen texts?

Malcolm wrote:

You can describe it like that, sure.

In Original Mind, Mlpham makes this distinction between the view of sūtra and the view of Anuyoga:

Furthermore, the Avatamska Sūtra asserts that the kāyas and pristine consciousnesses of buddhahood are impermanent by nature, but permanent by continuum. Those who assert the kāyas and pristine consciousnesses as the nature of the emptiness that possesses the supreme of all aspects are asserting that the kāyas and pristine consciousnesses are permanent by nature, and are asserting that they are impermanent by nature in the mode of appearing to trainees, according to what is taught in the Sūtra that Gathers All Intentions.

As such, from the perspective of the way reality is, while any phenomena included in the three times never moves from being the same by lacking birth and cessation in the natural state, since there is no need to reject or accept one side or the other of this duality arising distinctly as all phenomena there are such as self and other, samsara and nirvana, conditioned and unconditioned, past, present and future and so on, those in whom meaning of noncontradictory two truths that are equivalent with the teachings of the principles of realization endowed with eight profundities will easily give rise to the doubtless certain knowledge that is the intention of the sūtras and tantras of Mahāyāna. He mentions in another text:

In both the example luminosity and the vidyā of the Great Perfection, the reflection of the sky-like meaning luminosity is an appearance for the water-like mind. Though emptiness is ascertained by the mind (that meditates on emptiness) to be unconditioned, while the mind (in which that aspect arises) is unconditioned, a mind and an emptiness that are discrete will not appear in experience, but will be distinguished in the subsequent knowledge, just like the form of the sky in the water.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Received lung for Dudjom Rinpoche's "Buddhahood Without Meditation" twice now

krodha said:

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.

Sherab Dorje said:

Is there a difference?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, yes. Dudjom Lingpa passed away in 1904. Dudjom Rinpoche was born in 1904.

As far as the big red book goes, no, you don't need a lung, but it is good to receive it anyway.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Kelwin said:

As for the quote by Milarepa, I have no idea why that would refer to the Great Perfection? Is this the specific Tibetan terminology used here?

Malcolm wrote:

The term he uses for "prowess" is "nyams rtsal." The term is common enough, but the Lhasun is pointing out is his use of it in connection with awakened mind, byang chub sems, which Lhasun apparently takes as a Dzogchen reference.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Queequeg said:

At this point, easier said than done.

Malcolm wrote:

If we keep saying it, it will get done.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

DGA said:

related: is there a meaningful distinction between prajna and jnana in Zen discourse? this has come up as a problem before, for instance here

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=107&t=22352#p331645>

and elsewhere

Malcolm wrote:
No idea.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 2:44 AM
Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
"Pondering" means learning Dzogchen teachings throughly yourself. Reading Dudjom Rinpoche's Big Red Book will help that goal.

Sherab Dorje said:
Thanks for the tip. Do you need a lung for that one?

Received lung for Dudjom Rinpoche's "Buddhahood Without Meditation" twice now and plenty of tri, and it still has not shown me any specific points where Dzogchen (the state) differs from the state of Mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:
The state of Prajñāpāramitā, Mahāmudra, and Mahasandhi are the same; their paths however, different, and of course in my opinion, are respectively more profound. YMMV.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 1:25 AM
Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
You have not even begun.

Sherab Dorje said:
I notice that you did not answer to my points though. So you are not helping my pondering.

Malcolm wrote:
"Pondering" means learning Dzogchen teachings throughly yourself. Reading Dudjom Rinpoche's Big Red Book will help that goal.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 1:24 AM
Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma
Content:

Queequeg said:

For the principal that we act out of self interest? We can just proceed on Adam Smith's ideas. Makes no difference to me. Or Oliver Stone's Gordon Gecko - "Greed is Good!" The point is to pull some mental jiu-jitsu on that self interest by expanding the notion of self and turn it into a motivation for the common good.

Malcolm wrote:

I would rather just extend rights to the planet through giving it status as a legal person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This does not show that the mind arises because of afflictions. It merely shows that mind is conditioned by afflictions.

Astus said:

When there is one, there is the other, when the one is not, then the other is not - that is the basic structure of dependent origination.

Malcolm wrote:

Therefore, you are asserting that afflictions are a necessary precondition for the arising of the mind, period.

Astus said:

Are you also proposing Buddhas are like pieces of wood? Without any consciousness at all?

"Buddha-activity is unceasing because it is devoid of conceptualising"
(Uttaratantra 7.284, tr Holmes)

Malcolm wrote:

So you think buddhas are pieces of wood, inert, like rocks.

Astus said:

Beings experience buddhas and lands dependent on their perception. Buddhas are beyond thought and intention. What kind of consciousness is there to be for them?

Malcolm wrote:

Jñāna. The only difference between dualistic consciousness (vijñāna) and pristine consciousness (jñāna) is the presence and absence of the vi- prefix. They are both a

kind of consciousness, however, and they exist on a continuum. With the removal of obscurations of both afflictions and knowledge, vijñāna gradually becomes jñāna. The Uttaratantra states:

Sentient beings, bodhisattvas and tathāgatas are described as
Impure, impure and pure, and extremely pure, respectively.

And:

The dharmakāya is the pristine consciousness (jñāna, ye shes) of the Victor.

Astus said:

Is a buddha a consciousness?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhahood is a supramundane jñāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

[

Is that enough pondering?

.

Malcolm wrote:

You have not even begun.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Queequeg said:

Yeah, and Buddhism is about undoing that, naming that as one of our main problems. 80,000 scriptures explaining why and how we should go about this. I think we can say, this is an intrinsic problem that we have... what if we harnessed it?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't share your enthusiasm for trying to apply Buddhist philosophical principles in legislation. I think it is an error to do so. Why? We are not all Buddhists.

Queequeg said:

the idea that we are going to redraft the constitution on that theory is science fiction.

Malcolm wrote:

We don't have to redraft the constitution. All we have to do is recognize the planet and its ecosystems as legal persons. For example:

In a landmark case for the Rights of Nature, officials in New Zealand recently granted the Whanganui, the nation's third-longest river, with legal personhood "in the same way a company is, which will give it rights and interests". The decision follows a long court battle for the river's personhood initiated by the Whanganui River iwi, an indigenous community with strong cultural ties to the waterway.

<http://www.treehugger.com/environmental-policy/river-new-zealand-granted-legal-rights-person.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Is the Dharmakaya unconditioned and uncaused?

Content:

Coëmgenu said:

Pretty straightforward: is the Dharmakaya unconditioned and/or uncaused?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on who you ask.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Reasons are given. Now that Dudjom Rinpoche is your paramaguru, perhaps you should read and ponder his arguments which make the same six points.

Sherab Dorje said:

Perhaps, and perhaps I can also apply some critical thinking and discriminatory wisdom too. It's actually encouraged, if I remember correctly.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, perhaps you should ponder his arguments, rather than just go to the kneejerk fake Rime response.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2016 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Astus said:

A small reminder of the twelve nidanas then: ignorance -> formations -> consciousness -> name and form (name = consciousness) -> six ayatanas (sixth ayatana = consciousness).

"Only the skandhas, conditioned by defilement and action, go reincarnating themselves by means of the series of intermediate existences. As an example: the lamp."
(III.18a-d; vol 2, p 399)

Do you propose a consciousness beyond the five aggregates?

Malcolm wrote:

This does not show that the mind arises because of afflictions. It merely shows that mind is conditioned by afflictions.

Astus said:

We can know from many sources, including the Pabhassara Sutta, that afflictions are not inherent to the mind.

Afflictions are not inherent to the mind, and that's not been stated here. What is stated is that ignorance gives rise to birth, and birth includes the birth of consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhas are free from afflictive and uncontrolled birth. They, as well as bodhisattvas on the pure stages, appear wherever they like.

Are you also proposing Buddhas are like pieces of wood? Without any consciousness at all? Are you further proposing that afflictions are inherent to the skandhas?

Astus said:

If the mind arose from affliction, it could never be free of affliction

Wheat grows from the soil, but bread should not have soil in it. And there is the well known metaphor of the lotus. The whole world is said to arise from ignorance.

Malcolm wrote:

But it is never said that the mind arises from ignorance. Furthermore, your metaphor is mistaken. Bread may not have soil in it, but that is because bread is something refined from wheat. Wheat itself is inedible. It requires a great deal of processing to turn into bread.

The lotus example is used to describe how it is that the Buddha appeared in the swamp of samsara without being affected by it. The swamp is merely a condition, it is not a cause. The cause of a lotus is a lotus seed (bodhicitta). If you propose something which is a cause, like a wheat seed, it should produce a wheat plant, and not a lotus flower. Likewise, if the cause of the mind is ignorance (wheat seed) it is impossible that a mind

could ever be awakened (lotus), since its nature and its continuum is inherently ignorant (wheat), since its cause is ignorance (wheat seed).

Astus said:

If we follow your idea, it would seem that all there is samsara, and ultimately, when the mind ceases, samsara ceases.

When there is no more birth there is no more samsara. I have not realised this is my idea.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, pay more attention to what you write.

Astus said:

Why?

I'm not asking to leave Dzogchen out, but simply to provide others who support it.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

I prefer Dzogchen citations. Other people prefer sūtra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2016 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Do I have to meditate to be a Buddhist?

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

It's also impossible to experience a direct realisation of emptiness without practising formal sitting meditation on it because it is a very subtle object and we need powerful concentration and wisdom developed in formal meditation to realise it directly.

Malcolm wrote:

This isn't true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2016 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Well if a Dzogchenpa says that Dzogchen is superior to every other system then it must be true...

Malcolm wrote:

Reasons are given. Now that Dudjom Rinpoche is your paramaguru, perhaps you should read and ponder his arguments which make the same six points.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2016 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If ignorance were the ultimate or first cause of the mind (it isn't) than everything you say would make sense. But ignorance is not the ultimate or first cause of the mind, and in fact, ignorance is not inherent to the mind, as your query suggests. In fact, it is affliction in general that drives samsara, but afflictions do not drive the mind.

Astus said:

What Mahayana teaching is it that goes beyond the twelve links of dependent origination? The twelve is what establishes ignorance as the root cause...

Malcolm wrote:

In Chapter 3 of the Kośabhaṣyaṃ, Vasubandhu, representing the Sautrantika point of view, rejects the idea, quite decisively, that ignorance is the first cause of the 12 nidanas. And the Buddha never says anywhere that afflictions are the cause of the mind. Afflictions are merely the drivers of karma, and the result of karma is samsara. Further, people commonly make the error of not distinguishing between ignorance which is an affliction (the "first" link of the nidanas), and ignorance which is a knowledge obscuration which mistakenly apprehends a self — the two are not the same. The former, an affliction, arises from the latter.

Astus said:

and it is also what is given as the force driving both the mind and the whole of the world.

Malcolm wrote:

No, an afflicted mind results in karma, and karma results samsara, but it is never stated anywhere that afflictions are the cause of the mind. We can know from many sources, including the Pabhassara Sutta, that afflictions are not inherent to the mind. If the mind arose from affliction, it could never be free of affliction:

"Luminous, monks, is the mind. And it is defiled by incoming defilements."

"Luminous, monks, is the mind. And it is freed from incoming defilements."

If we follow your idea, it would seem that all there is samsara, and ultimately, when the mind ceases, samsara ceases.

Astus said:

(If possible please give something else as well, besides Dzogchen sources.)

Malcolm wrote:

Why?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2016 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Kelwin said:

Spaghetti monster tells me to say 'no'. Does it matter if it's him or me?

Termas are full of superiority complexes. I guess it kind of matters if it's 'just' individuals writing inspired poetry, or actually enlightened beings trying to guide us all to something better. It also gives a different perspective on the question whether Dzogchen is somehow superior to all other paths or not.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a very nice book composed by Lhatsun Namkhai Jigme which sets out to prove the superiority of Dzogchen. Perhaps I should translate it.

Kelwin said:

We've all read lots of texts saying it is superior. And lots of texts saying it is the same/similar. Personally, I like Tsele Natsok Rangdrol's perspective. Does Lhatsun Namkhai Jigme offer any new argument to the conversation that hasn't been translated before? I'd certainly be interested! Summary of the point he makes more than welcome.

Malcolm wrote:

He lists six points of superiority:

1. The Great Perfection is superior through its preliminary practice.
2. It is superior through its ripening empowerments.
3. It is superior through its physiology of nāḍīs, vāyus and bindus.
4. It is superior through the great transference rainbow body of the fourth vision of thögal.
5. It is superior through its method.
6. It is superior through its explanation of the measurement of liberation.

Indeed, he finds evidence that Milarepa practiced the preliminaries of the Great Perfection (ever a subject of controversy) in a verse from one of Mila's songs:

I, Milarepa, have gained prowess,
prowess in the training in awakened mind.

Dudjom Rinpoche more or less cribbs his arguments for the superiority of Dzogchen from this source.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2016 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Queequeg said:

You have to assume personhood.

It's a fiction and it's demands too much abstract thought.

Malcolm wrote:

We assume personhood with regards to human beings all the time, even though it is a fiction.

Queequeg said:

Much better approach is take advantage of people's grasping at self and show them how their self encompasses the planet. Then they want to protect the planet out of self interest.

Malcolm wrote:

It has not worked so far. When people think they own something, they generally think they have the right to exploit it for their own interests.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2016 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: Cognitive obscurations, how can they be?

Content:

muni said:

Since that mindstream lacks the slightest partiality, there is no basis for a singularity; because there is no partiality in that, all the infinite worlds are my body.

My body also appears as the infinite worlds and bodies of living beings.

The mind and traces are not the same, not different, and are very hard to investigate.

The mind that clings to entities and clings to cause and result

itself appears as cause and condition, but because they are nondual, there is no arising and perishing.

Because there is no arising and perishing, there is no self and other. Because there is no death and transmigration, there is no permanence and annihilation.

Therefore there is no delusion or samsara. In fact, there is also no nirvana.

Then how come, that our behaviour is often in contradiction of your wise sharing here?

How come that partiality still is and so the basis of singularity is? There is no self and other. _/_ How come mind still clings in behaviour to entities?

Yes. Any clinging is our problem, just as clinging to cause and result. But when we do not know the cause of our suffering, we suffer the results and this not knowing is itself

by the idea of a singularity its' confused clinging to entities/things and so it's actions = karma.

I think it is good to reflect and contemplate about what you shared here.

Malcolm wrote:

When we don't recognize our own state, we still perceive partiality, etc. There is no basis for singularity, since as it says above, there is no manyness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2016 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, dependent origination is a mind-driven process. Isn't that plainly obvious?

Astus said:

Of course. What is it that drives the mind? The Hinayana position is that it is ignorance, and with the ignorance removed there is no reason for another birth. Mahayana follows that view, that's why it needs to exchange ignorance with aspirations, since that type of understanding comes from the Hinayana version of the bodhisattva path, in other words, all the Mahayana explanations are built to back up an already accepted model. And the problem I see here is that it lacks the explanation for why arhats could not simply end the process, thus questioning the assumption that the mind-stream is unceasing.

Malcolm wrote:

If ignorance were the ultimate or first cause of the mind (it isn't) than everything you say would make sense. But ignorance is not the ultimate or first cause of the mind, and in fact, ignorance is not inherent to the mind, as your query suggests.

In fact, it is affliction in general that drives samsara, but afflictions do not drive the mind.

Third, just because one no longer takes rebirth in the three realms does not mean that one's mind has ceased to exist. The mind does not exist in the three realms; the three realms exist in the mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2016 at 10:23 AM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Queequeg said:

Expansive as that nominally is, it strikes me as ideological and ultimately false.

Why not just go all the way?

Buddha Dharma based constitution.

Malcolm wrote:

Because I am not into inflicting my religious beliefs on others and enshrining them into law.

But we do live in a biosphere, which ought to be treated as a person.

Queequeg said:

We hold these truths to be self evident... phenomena are empty; phenomena are conditional; phenomena are the middle way.

It is the duty of the State to Enhance the Freedoms and Advantages for all beings (basically, I think we can crib Nagarjuna's Jeweled Garland...)

Is Buddha Dharma religion? I thought it was reality...

Viewing biosphere as a person is as problematic as corporate personhood, though I'm more in favor of it, practically speaking.

But getting people to think of Gaia as a person... the misogynists will not let that happen, let alone the Christians.

I think we get further by encouraging the redefinition of people... without getting to emptiness, getting people to reflect on their dependently originated nature - even just at material levels - would probably be more effective than trying to convince people the Earth is a Person - whatever that could mean.

Malcolm wrote:

It means that she too has inalienable rights, the same as ours.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2016 at 10:08 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

there are no buddhas who made no aspirations

Astus said:

Ignorance cannot be what sustains rebirth, because then arhats would be finished, as they are without aspirations. It also cannot be established that arhats grasp at non-existence and that's why they succumb temporarily to an inactive state, since they are without any form of identification with anything. Furthermore, if aspirations are necessary for the buddhas to remain functional, that in itself means that dependent origination is driven by mental effort.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, dependent origination is a mind-driven process. Isn't that plainly obvious?

As for your other qualms, they have been adequately addressed already.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2016 at 7:52 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Kelwin said:

I guess that's a topic for a separate thread, but I'd be really interested to know how many people vote 'human invention', and how many people would vote 'deities teaching from another realm'. Possibly a bit of both.

Sherab Dorje said:

Is there a difference?

Kelwin said:

Spaghetti monster tells me to say 'no'. Does it matter if it's him or me?

Termas are full of superiority complexes. I guess it kind of matters if it's 'just' individuals writing inspired poetry, or actually enlightened beings trying to guide us all to something better. It also gives a different perspective on the question whether Dzogchen is somehow superior to all other paths or not.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a very nice book composed by Lhatsun Namkhai Jigme which sets out to prove the superiority of Dzogchen. Perhaps I should translate it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2016 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: Cognitive obscurations, how can they be?

Content:

tomschwarz said:

Please consider this and the vastness of reality's expanse when you feel anything categorical. It's bound to be wrong. No?

Malcolm wrote:

While I respect HHDL, I prefer Mañjuśrimitra's perspective more:

The mind that clings to entities and clings to cause and result

itself appears as cause and condition, but because they are nondual, there is no arising and perishing.

Because there is no arising and perishing, there is no self and other. Because there is no death and transmigration, there is no permanence and annihilation.

Therefore there is no delusion or samsara. In fact, there is also no nirvana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 20th, 2016 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

biocentric perspective

Queequeg said:

Expansive as that nominally is, it strikes me as ideological and ultimately false.

Why not just go all the way?

Buddha Dharma based constitution.

Malcolm wrote:

Because I am not into inflicting my religious beliefs on others and enshrining them into law.

But we do live in a biosphere, which ought to be treated as a person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2016 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Then you and CW are just talking past each other, are you not?

Astus said:

I do not see how. Consciousness, any kind, is necessarily conditioned. Nirvana is not a consciousness, but the final extinction of defilements. CW is of the opinion that somehow there can be an unconditioned consciousness. That I call illogical and impossible, because consciousness is always the awareness of something, and that means change, but change cannot happen to what is unconditioned.

treehuggingoctopus said:

Not quite. CW is of the opinion that all consciousness (vijñāna) is afflicted, unestablished and conditioned -- but there is also unafflicted cognition (aka as wisdom, jñāna) which is unestablished and unconditioned. Controversial?

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that there is a hard distinction between conditioned and unconditioned phenomena is a form of realism. The Dzogchen point of view is best, IMO:

It may be said, "The way all this is produced is dependent origination, arising and ceasing."

Like a burnt seed, a nonexistent is not produced from a nonexistent; the cause and the result do not exist.

The mind that clings to entities and clings to cause and result itself appears as cause and condition, but because they are nondual, there is no arising and perishing.

Because there is no arising and perishing, there is no self and other. Because there is no death and transmigration, there is no permanence and annihilation.

Therefore there is no delusion or samsara. In fact, there is also no nirvana.

-- Mañjuśrīmitra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2016 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Our systems depends on every American having 45,000 people work for them. At the cost of the environment. Our country is the number leading cause of global warming. Yes, I was saying that this the number of people in the world per first world citizen, whose labor is required to keep even the poorest of us in the lifestyle to which we've become accustomed.

Inge said:

Population in the US is 324,227,000

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Demography_of_the_United_States)

$324,227,000 \times 45,000 = 14,590,215,000,000$

World population is 7,400,000,000

$14,590,215,000,000 / 7,400,000,000 = 1971.65$

Are there people amounting to 1971.61 times the world population working for the Americans?

What about the numbers?

Malcolm wrote:

I will find the source of the stat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2016 at 9:00 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

All phenomena are anicca

Malcolm wrote:

No, space and the two kinds of cessation are unconditioned and permanent.

Crazywisdom said:

Nominal designations. One could have said something else. Like space is conditioned by vastness or such. Cessations also could have been made to not fit into category of phenomena

Malcolm wrote:

They are called dharmas because they bear characteristics. They belong to the dharmadhātu/dharmāyatana. Cessation due to analysis is nirvana. Cessation without analysis is simple absence of a cause for arising. Unconditioned space is the absence of obstruction, as the name indicates, akaśa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2016 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

It's enough to understand that the Khanda are Anatta, anicca and dukkha.

Malcolm wrote:

The skandhas do not include all phenomena.

Crazywisdom said:

All phenomena are anicca

Malcolm wrote:

No, space and the two kinds of cessation are unconditioned and permanent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2016 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

the cause of the continuity of buddhas is the force of previously made aspirations. This is not controversial. Buddhas are beyond birth and death, as are bodhisattvas on the

pure stages.

Astus said:

How can they be beyond rebirth when there is no end of birth?

Malcolm wrote:

They are beyond rebirth as a corollary of attaining power over birth through attaining patience for the non-arising of phenomena. Again, completely noncontroversial...the rest of your query is senseless, there are no buddhas who made no aspirations...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2016 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Mahakala Namcho

Content:

AnthonyKing said:

Hello

I have a request to the forum participants.

We were coming to town Dzatrul Rinpoche. And I would like to ask him for the practice of Mahakala.

But I do not know what the transmission lines it owns. My friends said that he most likely has Namchö.

And I would like to ask members of the forum of Mahakala Sadhana Namchö cycle. The texts with translations into any European language.

With them, I will ask for the transmission of Rinpoche.

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzatrul Rinpoche is principally a practitioner of Dudjom Tersar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2016 at 7:33 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

their continuums are sustained on infinite causes.

Astus said:

Ignorance is taught to be the root cause of birth. Saying that birth can never end means that ignorance cannot be the root cause. What is it then that sustains it?

Praṇidhāna-pāramitā.

For bodhisattvas and buddhas compassion is said to be the driving force so that they don't abandon beings. Such a condition is needed if birth can end. But since birth

cannot end, there is no need for such an aspiration, and there is always either a deluded or an enlightened inclination that sustains birth, in which case both types of beings are subjects to birth and death. Thus nirvana is samsara.

Malcolm wrote:

Astus, the cause of the continuity of buddhas is the force of previously made aspirations. This is not controversial. Buddhas are beyond birth and death, as are bodhisattvas on the pure stages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2016 at 7:06 AM

Title: Re: Cognitive obscurations, how can they be?

Content:

tomschwarz said:

So please consider the question, do sentient beings have "being"? Because if they do, then they most definitely exist based on the dictionary definition (versus Buddhist definition) of "exist".

Malcolm wrote:

The buddhist definition is the only one of interest to me, since I am interested in reality, and not delusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2016 at 7:05 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

It's enough to understand that the Khanda are Anatta, anicca and dukkha.

Malcolm wrote:

The skandhas do not include all phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2016 at 7:04 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Bakmoon said:

As mentioned previously, the Theravada school rejects the position that Nirvana is a cessation, and posits that Nirvana is a positive permanent phenomena, and that during the attainment of Nirvana, it is directly cognized by a supermundane consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, understood, in this respect their position is little different than Sarvastivada. The

Sautrantika view, IMO, is in fact better. YMMV.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2016 at 6:21 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is not that they must, it is simply that they do.

Astus said:

That still makes it an eternalist interpretation. Beings are literally immortal.

Malcolm wrote:

No, since their continuums are sustained on infinite causes.

Astus said:

Aspirations.

That is? Ordinary beings have selfish aspirations, while noble beings have selfless aspirations?

Malcolm wrote:

Praṇidhāna-pāramitā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2016 at 5:14 AM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Still it leaves us asking whether we should support demonstrably good things which came from demonstrably bad things, or go with something else.

Malcolm wrote:

The question we have to ask ourselves, is not what we want, but rather, what will people 7 generations from now want.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2016 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

That's part of the paradox of all modernity, not just America.

Malcolm wrote:

I agree, this extends to all countries where we can find advanced capitalism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2016 at 5:05 AM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

I'm not saying people should be silent at all, I'm simply stating that claiming that ignorance always = complicity is kind of pointless argument, as it means that individuals in every society on the planet ever are then guilty of the actions of it's power structures.

Malcolm wrote:

They are. There were no good Germans. It is not about guilt. It is about truth.

Johnny Dangerous said:

And grandstanding.

Being proud of some things within America (such as those mentioned in People's History which you cited) in no way means that people need to ignore the other things, in fact it should mean the opposite.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, all the good things mentioned in PHUS came as a result of the rise of an economically privileged class in the colonies. All the rest of the good things in America are also the result of the increasing economic privilege of Americans which has come at the cost of the wholesale environmental crisis we are presently living through. When one takes the biocentric perspective, it shows the fallacy of any version of American exceptionalism, from hard to soft.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2016 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Do we all need to be defined by the actions of our government and military apparatus?

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, I think we do. When we understand that we are viewed individually by the actions of our gvt., then we can't take a "what, who, me?" attitude. Silence = consent.

Johnny Dangerous said:

I'm not saying people should be silent at all, I'm simply stating that claiming that ignorance always = complicity is kind of pointless argument, as it means that individuals in every society on the planet ever are then guilty of the actions of it's power structures.

Malcolm wrote:

They are. There were no good Germans. It is not about guilt. It is about truth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2016 at 4:43 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, since Sautrantikas assert that Nirvana is a nonexistence, it is definite that the highest Hinayāna view maintains that nirvana is a nonexistence. Other Hinayāna schools maintain that nirvana is some unconditioned phenomena, belonging to cessation due to insight.

Astus said:

I assume you're referring to this:

Malcolm wrote:

I was referring to another discussion on the nature of Nirvana in the Kośa, whether unconditioned Nirvana posited by the Sarvastivadins is critiqued and found wanting.

Astus said:

If the purified continuums of buddhas and bodhisattvas do not continue forever, it follows that they must somehow cease.

That is simply exchanging "self" for "continuum", and positing the extremes of existence and non-existence.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not simply exchanging a self for a continuum. It is also not positing any extreme of either.

Astus said:

If they must somehow cease, this is an annihilationist position.

And if they must persist, it is the eternalist position.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not that they must, it is simply that they do.

Astus said:

If you are argue it is merely a self within that continuum that does not cease because it does not exist, this still leaves us with the purified continuum of buddhas and bodhisattvas persisting forever since there is no condition by which such a continuum should cease given that there is no condition by which the continuums of sentient beings, the object of their compassion, will cease.

What is the maintaining force of that continuum? It cannot be ignorance, or defilements, nor can it be wisdom, or compassion. Then what?

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Aspirations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2016 at 4:35 AM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Do we all need to be defined by the actions of our government and military apparatus?

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, I think we do. When we understand that we are viewed individually by the actions of our gvt., then we can't take a "what, who, me?" attitude. Silence = consent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2016 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The latter leads to the former.

Astus said:

Not necessarily, because one can attain not only arhatship but also the state of the non-returner.

The Mahāyāna point is that arhats, when they pass away, enter that equipoise and remain there, since we do not accept that there can be an absolute cessation of the mind.

There is no arising, hence no cessation either. It is because all appearances are unborn that they are no different from nirvana. That's why the emptiness of phenomena is emphasised as the unique wisdom of bodhisattvas.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this emptiness of phenomena is a unique point of Mahāyāna unknown in to

Hinayāna adherents. I know you are valiantly trying to save Hinayāna tenets from being hoisted on their own petard but...

Astus said:

However, it is a misinterpretation even in Hinayana to say that an arhat ceases to exist, for the same reason it is a mistake in Mahayana: there is nothing to cease.

Malcolm wrote:

No, since Sautrantikas assert that Nirvana is a nonexistence, it is definite that the highest Hinayāna view maintains that nirvana is a nonexistence. Other Hinayāna schools maintain that nirvana is some unconditioned phenomena, belonging to cessation due to insight.

Astus said:

At the same time, there is nothing to persist either. So, saying that the mind-stream continues on forever is at best a provisional teaching for those afraid of becoming nothing.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is the basis of stating that the supreme cessation is the non-abiding nirvana of buddhas and bodhisattvas. If the purified continuums of buddhas and bodhisattvas do not continue forever, it follows that they must somehow cease. If they must somehow cease, this is an annihilationist position. If you argue it is merely a self within that continuum that does not cease because it does not exist, this still leaves us with the purified continuum of buddhas and bodhisattvas persisting forever since there is no condition by which such a continuum should cease given that there is no condition by which the continuums of sentient beings, the object of their compassion, will cease.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 19th, 2016 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Queequeg said:

Its worth keeping, because, seriously, what's the better alternative? And how do we get there, if you even have an answer to that.

We have to stop careening down this unsustainable path. If we don't, there won't be much a world left for anyone, especially children.

We're talking about different things. You're focusing on the present economic system. I agree with you that the level of waste in our society is unsustainable. We do need to rethink many of our values and norms. I don't think that is accomplished, by say, eliminating the various freedoms that define America, or abandoning the basic model of government we have, or to retreat from our common assumption that we all should all

have the space to pursue "happiness". My idea of what ought to be perpetuated is not the economic system.

Malcolm wrote:

Our economic system is predicated on the idea of happiness = property. The implication of this is that property = rights, and that those with less property are less entitled to rights, and therefore, are less entitled to happiness.

Queequeg said:

What we need is a change in thought and assumptions about what the good life is

Malcolm wrote:

First, we have to abandon the idea that property = happiness.

Queequeg said:

Dumping what's good about America because of what's bad is not a realistic approach.

Malcolm wrote:

We need to rewrite the constitution from a biocentric perspective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 18th, 2016 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Abhidharmasammuvaya, pg. 135

Astus said:

That talks about nirodha, the third noble truth. I meant there nirodhasamapatti, the 9th dhyana. They are not the same.

Malcolm wrote:

The latter leads to the former. The Mahāyāna point is that arhats, when they pass away, enter that equipoise and remain there, since we do not accept that there can be an absolute cessation of the mind. For example, on the next page, Asanga notes that the supreme state of nirodha is the nonabiding nirvana of the Buddhas and bodhisattvas which allows them to continue to benefit sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 18th, 2016 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

There is a something not conditioned, if there weren't the path would be impossible.

Astus said:

I didn't say there is nothing unconditioned. I said that consciousness cannot be unconditioned. It is nirvana that is unconditioned.

treehuggingoctopus said:

Astus, out of curiosity: what do you mean by "consciousness"? Are you using it in the specific context of the skandhas, dhatus and ayatanas, or in the broadest possible sense, to designate all and any possible types of cognition?

Malcolm wrote:

He means the aggregate of consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 18th, 2016 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Astus said:

If it (nirodha) were the same as nirvana, there would be no need to see it with discernment/wisdom. Furthermore, it could not be that one doesn't attain arhatship.

Malcolm wrote:

[4]What is it (nirodha) from the point of view of convention? It is the cessation acquired through the abolition of of the seeds (bijanigraha) by means of worldly paths (laukikamarga). The Blessed One called it a "partial Nirvāṇa" (tadaṃśikanirvāṇa)...

[6] What is its complete state (paripūri)? It is the cessation acquired by those who are no longer in training (aśaikṣa), such as the fruit of arhatship (arhatvaphala).

-- Abhidharmasammuvaya, pg. 135

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 18th, 2016 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Cognitive obscurations, how can they be?

Content:

tomschwarz said:

in any case, "exist" is a simple english word, filled with all kinds of meanings, so to speak so concretely about it, we must understand what it means to us, what meaning we want it to have...

Malcolm wrote:

You really don't need to get all that complex about it. Exists means "something which can be established."

tomschwarz said:

))) OK. But please answer the two questions. And now a third, what does it mean to establish something? Again lots of meanings....which one would you like to use hear? E.g. Donald Trump was established as the Republican Candidate of this year's presidential race. So that worked.

White Lotus, great point.

Malcolm wrote:

In Buddhist parlance, "establish" means to prove something incontrovertibly. So in this sense, conventionally we can say Trump is the Republican nominee, since it accords with conventional perception. But even, so, it won't stand up to ultimate analysis (apart from his toupee, which appears to be the only inherently existent thing in the universe).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 18th, 2016 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Queequeg said:

Where do you get that?

Sherab Dorje said:

He is talking about how many people globally have to be deprived in regards to their basic needs (of resources) in order for one American to live their lifestyle, to enjoy their level of consumption. He doesn't mean actually working for you personally.

Have you ever visited a third world country?

Queequeg said:

I don't know if that's what he was saying.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I was saying that this the number of people in the world per first world citizen, whose labor is required to keep even the poorest of us in the lifestyle to which we've become accustomed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 18th, 2016 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Queequeg said:

I think my view is something like this: this is a pretty good system; as good as any that has ever been organized by human beings, on a scale that is unprecedented.

Malcolm wrote:

Our systems depends on every American having 45,000 people work for them. At the cost of the environment. Our country is the number leading cause of global warming.

Queequeg said:

Where do you get that?

Malcolm wrote:

Some analysis of the world labor cost required to keep our standard of living where it is; right now, I don't recall where I read it.

Queequeg said:

In any event, seriously, people exploiting people is not the real long term concern. We're going to be overwhelmed by automation sooner than later.

Malcolm wrote:

This is still people exploiting people.

Queequeg said:

Its worth keeping, because, seriously, what's the better alternative? And how do we get there, if you even have an answer to that.

Malcolm wrote:

We have to stop careening down this unsustainable path. If we don't, there won't be much a world left for anyone, especially children.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 17th, 2016 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma

Content:

Queequeg said:

I think my view is something like this: this is a pretty good system; as good as any that has ever been organized by human beings, on a scale that is unprecedented.

Malcolm wrote:

Our systems depends on every American having 45,000 people work for them. At the cost of the environment. Our country is the number leading cause of global warming.

Queequeg said:
Its worth trying to keep going.

Malcolm wrote:
At the price listed above, not a chance.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 17th, 2016 at 4:55 AM
Title: Re: Difference in attainments
Content:

TRC said:
Firstly, nirodhasamapatti has nothing to do with nirvana. Nirvana is not the cessation of perception and feeling. Secondly, nirodhasamapatti has nothing to do with “commoners”, it is only available to non-returners and above.

Malcolm wrote:
Nirvana, as conceived in Hinayāna, is indeed the utter cessation of one's stream based on analysis (pratisamkhyanirodha). Perceptions and feelings are included in everything that ceases. The Sauntranikas, according to the Kosha, even go so far as the assert that Nirvana is nonexistence.

Nirvana with remainder, of course, is does not involve death. Nirvana without remainder most certainly involves death.

The Mahāyāna criticism of these various positions is well known. No need to repeat it here.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 17th, 2016 at 4:31 AM
Title: Re: Flavors of Nationalism... and the wind tossed seas of Open Dharma
Content:

Queequeg said:
I get why you don't fly the colors. When I fly the colors, its acknowledgement of the good and bad, but also determination to make it better. Its about time we took that symbol back from the yahoos. We should make Woodie Guthrie's anthem our national anthem.

Malcolm wrote:
I just don't think the legacy of the USA has much in which one could justifiably take pride.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The only difference between the two, as I already said, is whether it belongs to an ārya or not. In the case of an ārya, it leads to the elimination of afflictions, in the case of a commoner, it does not.

Astus said:

Both are available only to aryas. However, neither of them are nirvana. And the point is that nirodhasamapatti is not the destination of arhats.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, technically, nirodhasamapatti and nirvikalpa samadhi are the same, differentiated by whether one is a commoner or a buddha, and the latter is the vajropamasamadhi of a buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Cognitive obscurations, how can they be?

Content:

tomschwarz said:

in any case, "exist" is a simple english word, filled with all kinds of meanings, so to speak so concretely about it, we must understand what it means to us, what meaning we want it to have...

Malcolm wrote:

You really don't need to get all that complex about it. Exists means "something which can be established."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 8:02 PM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Queequeg said:

Letter from a Birmingham Jail is America.

Malcolm wrote:

MLK was murdered by America.

Queequeg said:

Eugene Debs is America.

Malcolm wrote:
Imprisoned by America.

Queequeg said:
Ken Kesey is America.

Malcolm wrote:
Institutionalized by America.

Queequeg said:
Rock and Roll is America.

Malcolm wrote:
Stolen from black people by America.

Just face it, this country's history is one of ethnic cleansing, human trafficking, genocide, ecocide, and wars of aggression, one after another.

There are individuals who have come from America, like MLK, etc., who are worthy of admiration. But on the whole, our track record is pretty appalling.

I would no more hang the stars and stripes on my house than I would the stars and bars.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 7:56 PM
Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
...damned if I'm going to let these people define the American experience, personally.

Malcolm wrote:
They already have.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 7:54 PM
Title: Re: Difference in attainments
Content:
Astus said:
As for vajropamasamadhi, that is the attainment eliminating all defilements that leads to nirvana (Kosha, vol 3, p 981-3, 1020-1021; Samuccaya p 174), so it is different from nirodhasamapatti that does not necessarily lead to the elimination of all defilements.

Malcolm wrote:
The only difference between the two, as I already said, is whether it belongs to an ārya

or not. In the case of an ārya, it leads to the elimination of afflictions, in the case of a commoner, it does not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: Cognitive obscurations, how can they be?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

So the magical apparitions magically appear and do all the dharma actions, like build centers, stupas, translate texts, etc.?

Malcolm wrote:

Since that mindstream lacks the slightest partiality, there is no basis for a singularity; because there is no partiality in that, all the infinite worlds are my body.

My body also appears as the infinite worlds and bodies of living beings.

The mind and traces are not the same, not different, and are very hard to investigate.

-- Mañjuśrīmitra

Crazywisdom said:

So everything that appears including dharma actions belong to the Buddha's kayas?

Malcolm wrote:

The phenomena of āryas and commoners arise from one's mindstream and do not exist anywhere else.

Also, that diversity in the realms of the six beings is one's samadhi.

—— Mañjuśrīmitra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: Cognitive obscurations, how can they be?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

So who's teaching Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

The magical apparitions of the teacher, of course.

Crazywisdom said:

So the magical apparitions magically appear and do all the dharma actions, like build centers, stupas, translate texts, etc.?

Malcolm wrote:

Since that mindstream lacks the slightest partiality, there is no basis for a singularity; because there is no partiality in that, all the infinite worlds are my body.

My body also appears as the infinite worlds and bodies of living beings.

The mind and traces are not the same, not different, and are very hard to investigate.

-- Mañjuśrīmitra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 4:40 AM

Title: Re: Cognitive obscurations, how can they be?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

And how does such a one uphold a Buddha's vow to benefit sentient beings?

Malcolm wrote:

Since the awakening of the sugata does not exist, his magical apparitions appear to the deluded, similar to an illusion.

-- Mañjuśrīmitra

Crazywisdom said:

So who's teaching Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

The magical apparitions of the teacher, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 4:30 AM

Title: Re: Cognitive obscurations, how can they be?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

This isn't nihilism because...?

And one shouldn't perform auspicious actions for beings within the view bc...?

Malcolm wrote:

It may be said, "The way all this is produced is dependent origination, arising and ceasing."

Like a burnt seed, a nonexistent is not produced from a nonexistent; the cause and the result do not exist.

The mind that clings to entities and clings to cause and result

itself appears as cause and condition, but because they are nondual, there is no arising

and perishing.

Because there is no arising and perishing, there is no self and other. Because there is no death and transmigration, there is no permanence and annihilation.

Therefore there is no delusion or samsara. In fact, there is also no nirvana.

-- Mañjuśrīmitra

Crazywisdom said:

And how does such a one uphold a Buddha's vow to benefit sentient beings?

Malcolm wrote:

Since the awakening of the sugata does not exist, his magical apparitions appear to the deluded, similar to an illusion.

-- Mañjuśrīmitra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: Cognitive obscurations, how can they be?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Interdependent actions and fruits?

Malcolm wrote:

Do not abandon or dwell in any Dharma at all, with or without doubt.

Since the meditator and the dharmadhātu do not exist, there is nothing to doubt and there is nothing to perceive as ultimate.

-- Mañjuśrīmitra

Crazywisdom said:

This isn't nihilism because...?

And one shouldn't perform auspicious actions for beings within the view bc...?

Malcolm wrote:

It may be said, "The way all this is produced is dependent origination, arising and ceasing."

Like a burnt seed, a nonexistent is not produced from a nonexistent; the cause and the result do not exist.

The mind that clings to entities and clings to cause and result

itself appears as cause and condition, but because they are nondual, there is no arising and perishing.

Because there is no arising and perishing, there is no self and other. Because there is no death and transmigration, there is no permanence and annihilation.

Therefore there is no delusion or samsara. In fact, there is also no nirvana.

-- Mañjuśrīmitra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: Cognitive obscurations, how can they be?

Content:

muni said:

If there is a complete nonexistence, it is nihilism, which is not possible by the union of the two truths.

:

Malcolm wrote:

The two truths do not exist, so how can they be in union?

Crazywisdom said:

Interdependent actions and fruits?

Malcolm wrote:

Do not abandon or dwell in any Dharma at all, with or without doubt.

Since the meditator and the dharmadhātu do not exist, there is nothing to doubt and there is nothing to perceive as ultimate.

-- Mañjuśrimitra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Cognitive obscurations, how can they be?

Content:

muni said:

If there is a complete nonexistence, it is nihilism, which is not possible by the union of the two truths.

:

Malcolm wrote:

The two truths do not exist, so how can they be in union?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Rakz said:

But if it did end then Buddhas would too enter into the samadhi of cessation like they

already do temporarily after the universe gets destroyed.

Astus said:

Nirvana is not nirodhasamapatti (samadhi of cessation). Otherwise yes, that is one of the interpretations, and that's why bodhisattvas are said to delay the attainment of nirvana.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it is, the only difference between vajropama-samadhi and nirodhasamapatti is whether one is an ārya or not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Admin_PC said:

Many of the Tejano elite backed the abortive attempt to set up an independent Republic of the North in 1813. Later, Tejanos were ardent supporters of the successful Mexican revolt against Spain in 1821, only to grow as unhappy with Mexican rule as with Spanish rule.

"Norteños who had an iffy relationship with the Mexican Empire"

Malcolm wrote:

I don't see how these do anything but reinforce what I was saying. There was already native & norteños discontent. Maybe I misread your statement, but your comment sounded like it was nothing but anglos making a land grab.[/quote]

The state of Texas was a result primarily an Anglo land grab.

Admin_PC said:

It should also be noted that not all natives were indigenous to this area. The Comanches in particular migrated here after the anglo settlers.

So when you read about the Rangers fighting Comanches, it should be understood that the Comanches often raided outside their territory in a general migration south...

Malcolm wrote:

They were clan based nomads. Their territory was always fluid.

Texas History Online said:

Call Houston a drunk if you want to, but he did advise against joining the Civil War: Many Texans considered the election of Abraham Lincoln to the presidency (November 1860)

as a threat to slavery. They urged Governor Sam Houston to call a convention of the people to determine what course of action the state should take. Houston, devoted both to Texas and the Union, paid little heed to these requests, refusing to take any step that might aid secession. The demands for a convention increased, however, with the secession of South Carolina in December 1860 and the calling of state secession conventions in Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, and Louisiana in early January. A group of secessionist leaders, including O. M. Roberts, John S. (Rip) Ford, George M. Flournoy, and William P. Rogers, issued an address to the people calling for the election of delegates to a state Secession Convention in early January. Houston attempted to forestall the convention by calling a special session of the legislature and recommending that it refuse to recognize the convention. Instead, the legislature gave approval to the convention, on the condition that the people ratify its outcome by a final vote.

The convention, which assembled in Austin on January 28, 1861, was dominated by secessionists. On February 1 the delegates adopted an ordinance of secession by a vote of 166 to 8. This ordinance was approved by the voters of the state, 46,153 to 14,747, on February 23. The convention reassembled in early March, declared Texas out of the Union, and adopted a measure uniting the state with other Southern states in the newly formed Confederate States of America. Governor Houston, who refused to recognize the authority of the convention to take this action, refused to take an oath of allegiance to the new government, whereupon the convention declared the office of governor vacant and elevated Lieutenant Governor Edward Clark to the position. President Lincoln offered to send troops to assist Houston if he would resist the convention, but Houston rejected the offer rather than bring on civil conflict within the state. He retired to his home in Huntsville, where he died on July 26, 1863.

Malcolm wrote:

It appears he both rejected the Confederacy, as well as rejected help from Lincoln to restore order.

Anyway, my main point still stands, "I like where I live too. This does not blind me to the fact that I live here by virtue of the fact that English Settlers began a program of ethnic cleansing and genocide against native people beginning in the 17th century", etc. This is as true of Texas as it is true of everywhere else in the United States and Canada, i.e, the wherever there was an Anglo Hegemony. The Spanish hegemony in Mexico, etc., has its own analysis and problems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Texas was an incursion by slavers into what was a underpopulated Mestizo enclave made of largely of Norteños who had an iffy relationship with the Mexican Empire.

There was no Texas revolution, in others words. It was, from the beginning, a land grab by white settlers.

Admin_PC said:

Gross mischaracterization based on a total rewriting of history, in favor of pushing an apologetic narrative.

That's not how it went down.

<http://www.houstonculture.org/hispanic/alamo.html>

<http://www.houstonchronicle.com/news/columnists/native-texan/article/Tejanos-played-key-role-in-Texas-Revolution-5413847.php>

<https://www.tamu.edu/faculty/ccbn/dewitt/adp/archives/newsarch/tejano.html>

<http://www.tamu.edu/faculty/ccbn/dewitt/tejanoorigins.htm>

<http://www.tamu.edu/faculty/ccbn/dewitt/tejanopatriots.htm> As a proportion of the population, the active participation of Hispanic native and immigrant residents in the struggle for independence of Texas from Spain and Mexico was equal to or greater in specific battles than that of resident immigrants from the United States of the North--
Don Guillermo

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is exactly how it went down, as your own documents show:

"underpopulated Mestizo enclave" and "slavers (pro-slavery whites like Sam Houston)"

Admin_PC said:

" In 1836, about 4,000 Tejanos lived north of the Nueces River, where settlement was concentrated. Anglos numbered about 35,000, most of them fairly recent arrivals from the United States, Poyo said.

Malcolm wrote:

"Norteños who had an iffy relationship with the Mexican Empire"

Admin_PC said:

There had been a pattern of resistance to the rule of central government from Mexico City since the Spanish period of the 1770s, he said. That feeling predated the dissatisfaction with the Anglos by 50 years, according to Poyo.

Malcolm wrote:

And:

Many of the Tejano elite backed the abortive attempt to set up an independent Republic of the North in 1813. Later, Tejanos were ardent supporters of the successful Mexican revolt against Spain in 1821, only to grow as unhappy with Mexican rule as with Spanish rule.

Dunbar-Ortiz writes:

The Republic of Mexico opened a door to US domination by granting land to Anglo immigrants. During the first decade of Mexican independence, some thirty thousand Anglo-American farmers and plantation owners, along with their slaves, poured into Texas, receiving development land grants. By the time Texas became a US state in 1845,

Anglo settlers numbered 160,000.¹⁸ Mexico abolished slavery in 1829, which affected the Anglo-American settlers' quest for wealth in building plantations worked by enslaved Africans. They lobbied the Mexican government for a reversal of the ban and gained only a one-year extension to settle their affairs and free their bonded workers—the government refused to legalize slavery. The settlers decided to secede from Mexico, initiating the famous and mythologized 1836 Battle of the Alamo, where the mercenaries James Bowie and Davy Crockett and slave owner William Travis were killed. Although technically an Anglo-American loss, the siege of the Alamo served to stir Anglo patriotic passions, and within a month at the decisive Battle of San Jacinto, Mexico handed over the province. This was a great victory for the Andrew Jackson administration, for Jackson's brother, Mason, who was one of the Texas planters, and especially for the alcoholic settler-warrior hero Sam Houston. The former governor of Tennessee, Houston was made commander in chief of the Texas army and president of the new "Texas republic," which he helped guide to US statehood in 1845. One of the first acts of the pro-slavery independent government was to establish a counterinsurgency force that—as its name, the Texas Rangers, suggests—followed the "American way of war" in destroying Indigenous towns, eliminating Native nations in Texas, pursuing ethnic cleansing, and suppressing protest from Tejanos, former Mexican citizens.

Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne (2014-09-16). *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States (ReVisioning American History)* (pp. 126-127). Beacon Press. Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Admin_PC said:

How? When there were indigenous tribes & people of majority indigenous blood making up both the Mexican side in the Mexican Revolution & the Texas side in the Texas Revolution?

Malcolm wrote:

Texas was an incursion by slavers into what was a underpopulated Mestizo enclave made of largely of Norteños who had an iffy relationship with the Mexican Empire.

There was no Texas revolution, in others words. It was, from the beginning, a land grab by white settlers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Admin_PC said:

But being accused of "American exceptionalism" just because I happen to like a few

things about where I live .

Malcolm wrote:

I like where I live too. This does not blind me to the fact that I live here by virtue of the fact that English Settlers began a program of ethnic cleansing and genocide against native people beginning in the 17th century:

“REDSKINS”

Indigenous people continued to resist by burning settlements and killing and capturing settlers. As an incentive to recruit fighters, colonial authorities introduced a program of scalp hunting that became a permanent and long-lasting element of settler warfare against Indigenous nations. During the Pequot War, Connecticut and Massachusetts colonial officials had offered bounties initially for the heads of murdered Indigenous people and later for only their scalps, which were more portable in large numbers. But scalp hunting became routine only in the mid-1670s, following an incident on the northern frontier of the Massachusetts colony. The practice began in earnest in 1697 when settler Hannah Dustin, having murdered ten of her Abenaki captors in a nighttime escape, presented their ten scalps to the Massachusetts General Assembly and was rewarded with bounties for two men, two women, and six children.

Dustin soon became a folk hero among New England settlers. Scalp hunting became a lucrative commercial practice. The settler authorities had hit upon a way to encourage settlers to take off on their own or with a few others to gather scalps, at random, for the reward money. “In the process,” John Grenier points out, “they established the large-scale privatization of war within American frontier communities.” Although the colonial government in time raised the bounty for adult male scalps, lowered that for adult females, and eliminated that for Indigenous children under ten, the age and gender of victims were not easily distinguished by their scalps nor checked carefully. What is more, the scalp hunter could take the children captive and sell them into slavery. These practices erased any remaining distinction between Indigenous combatants and noncombatants and introduced a market for Indigenous slaves. Bounties for Indigenous scalps were honored even in absence of war. Scalps and Indigenous children became means of exchange, currency, and this development may even have created a black market. Scalp hunting was not only a profitable privatized enterprise but also a means to eradicate or subjugate the Indigenous population of the Anglo-American Atlantic seaboard. The settlers gave a name to the mutilated and bloody corpses they left in the wake of scalp-hunts: redskins.

Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne (2014-09-16). *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States* (ReVisioning American History) (pp. 64-65). Beacon Press. Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Admin_PC said:

I'm sorry you neighbors from Oceana hate us so much, but maybe you should save your

vitriol for when we actually do something wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

White people in OZ are us, and they are still brutalizing indigenous people in that country.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Admin_PC said:

I would hardly say its "history is nothing more nor less than" its atrocities.

Malcolm wrote:

Our history, all the things we imagine are positive about the United States, is predicated upon on our systematic practices of ethnic cleansing, genocide and human trafficking, for example, Texas, California, etc.

Perhaps you can give some examples of the positive things about the US which are not predicated upon this legacy?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 16th, 2016 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Admin_PC said:

No, merely mentioning pride in our country...

Malcolm wrote:

As an American, I see no reason at all to be proud of the United States of America. Its history is nothing more nor less than a history of European colonial expansion made possible by ethnic cleansing, human trafficking, and genocide.

Required reading:

1492 and 1493

The People's History of the United States by Howard Zinn

The Indigenous People's History of United States by Roxanna Dunbar-Ortiz

The new Jim Crow by Michelle Alexander

Etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2016 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Admin_PC said:

"In God we Trust"

Malcolm wrote:

...was only adopted as the US motto in 1956.

Admin_PC said:

All of this, I now think, is not quite right. "Deism" in its own day referred not to a superficial theological doctrine but to a comprehensive intellectual tradition that ranged freely across the terrain we now associate with ethics, political theory, metaphysics, the philosophy of mind, and epistemology. It was an astonishingly coherent and systematic body of thought, closer to a way of being than any particular dogma, and it retained its essential elements over a span of centuries, not decades. In origin and substance, deism was neither British nor Christian, as the conventional view supposes, but largely ancient, pagan, and continental, and it spread in America far beyond the educated elite. Although America's revolutionary deists lavished many sincere expressions of adoration upon their deity, deism is in fact functionally indistinguishable from what we would now call "pantheism"; and pantheism is really just a pretty word for atheism. While deism could often be associated with moderation in politics, it served principally to advance a system of thought that was revolutionary in its essence and effects. This essentially atheistic and revolutionary aspect of deism, I further contend, is central to any credible explanation of the revolutionary dimension of the American Revolution. In a word, America's founders were philosophical radicals.

Malcolm wrote:

Stewart, Matthew (2014-07-01). Nature's God: The Heretical Origins of the American Republic (pp. 5-6). W. W. Norton & Company. Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2016 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Karma_Yeshe said:

To the way things are presented: I mean the "Garland of Views" is not taught by a Tibetan, but by Padmasambhava.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe.

Karma_Yeshe said:

What makes you question the Padmasambhava's authorship?

Malcolm wrote:
Lack of provenance.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2016 at 1:06 AM
Title: Re: Difference in attainments
Content:
Rakz said:
True. The ultimate destination in Mahayana is cessation as well once samsara is emptied out.

Malcolm wrote:
No, because there is still Akaniṣṭha Gandavyuha, where the sambhogakāya enjoys (bhoga) the dharma together with (sam) the two retinues; the retinue he emanates, and the retinue of bodhisattvas who take birth there.

Thus, nonabiding nirvana is the goal of Mahāyāna, i.e., a nirvana where one never abides in extremes of samsara or nirvana.

Crazywisdom said:
But the commentary on the Guhyagarbha says Samantabhadra's retinue is a self-reflection.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, that is the retinue of his own nature. But there is also a retinue which is not his own nature, i.e., bodhisattvas on the irreversible stages who take birth there.

It also depends on which Akaniṣṭha you are talking about, Dharmakāya level or Sambhogakāya level.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2016 at 1:05 AM
Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
That very much depends on which Tibetans. The Sakyapas, especially the Ngorpas, certainly have the opposite attitude.
Just to add to this point — much of the polemics in Tibet are precisely about who is more faithful to the India tradition and who has departed from the Indian model.

Crazywisdom said:
Again I point out they are riffing about the monastic Tantra of late Indian Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they are mainly arguing about how to properly interpret the Nalanda tantric tradition circa 1000 CE.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2016 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Let's assume there are no sentient beings and no bodhisattvas, just Buddhas. There would be no point of form kayas. Compassion would be meaningless. What samadhi would a Buddha have then? I think it would have to be cessation.

Rakz said:

True. The ultimate destination in Mahayana is cessation as well once samsara is emptied out.

Malcolm wrote:

No, because there is still Akaniṣṭha Gandavyuha, where the sambhogakāya enjoys (bhoga) the dharma together with (sam) the two retinues; the retinue he emanates, and the retinue of bodhisattvas who take birth there.

Thus, nonabiding nirvana is the goal of Mahāyāna, i.e., a nirvana where one never abides in extremes of samsara or nirvana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2016 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Remember the Tibetans want you to think their books are definitive and the Indian one's are provisional.

Malcolm wrote:

That very much depends on which Tibetans. The Sakyapas, especially the Ngorpas, certainly have the opposite attitude.

Just to add to this point — much of the polemics in Tibet are precisely about who is more faithful to the India tradition and who has departed from the Indian model.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 15th, 2016 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: Michael James on Ramana

Content:
dreambow said:
Many people find Ramana Maharshi inspirational.

Malcolm wrote:
Great. Let them find him inspirational on the nonduality forum.

Karma Dorje said:
Yes, florin can't you see that this is a forum for feminist ranting about Asian culture?!
Stay on topic, man!

Down with the patriarchy!

Malcolm wrote:
If it was a matriarchy, one would have to rant about that, too.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2016 at 11:50 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?
Content:
Karma_Yeshe said:
To the way things are presented: I mean the "Garland of Views" is not taught by a Tibetan, but by Padmasambhava.

Malcolm wrote:
Maybe.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2016 at 11:50 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?
Content:
Crazywisdom said:
Remember the Tibetans want you to think their books are definitive and the Indian one's are provisional.

Malcolm wrote:
That very much depends on which Tibetans. The Sakyapas, especially the Ngorpas, certainly have the opposite attitude.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2016 at 11:48 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?
Content:
Crazywisdom said:

I don't agree the Indian tantras are provisional in meaning.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, we can disagree on one whether gsar ma tantras, as well as mahāyoga tantras are provisional. Like everything, YMMV.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2016 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That does not mean they are of no interest. They are. But I don't have time to read everything.

Losal Samten said:

How many Dzogchen tantras would you guesstimate we have preserved?

Malcolm wrote:

14 volumes in the Rnying ma rgyud 'bum alone, not to mention hundreds of tantras in various terma cycles that have been revealed over the centuries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2016 at 10:57 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Sure Dzogchen texts have their own way of explaining stuff. Great. But that's all.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Dzogchen tantras and texts explain their own approach to awakening. To me, Dzogchen tantras and texts are much more interesting than gsar ma tantra (as well as tantras of mahāyoga), because, including the Guhyagarbha, those tantras are provisional in meaning. That does not mean they are of no interest. They are. But I don't have time to read everything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2016 at 10:48 AM

Title: Re: Empowerments in different yantras

Content:

PuerAzelis said:

The DI is not just in the syllable itself?

Which parts are which, awareness expression, expressive power of awareness, initiation of the display of awareness, etc?

Malcolm wrote:

Any direct introduction possesses three lineages: the aural lineage, the symbolic lineage and the lineage of the transcendent state.

You must be able to understand the first two in order to grasp the meaning, which is contained in the third.

All of this constitutes empowerment of the potentiality of vidyā (rig pa'i rtsal dbang).

This is why the Syllableless Tantra states:

[T]he dharmakāya is encountered in the intimate instruction.

The dharmakāya is the lineage of the transcendent state; the intimate instruction is the aural lineage and the symbolic lineage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2016 at 6:31 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

But any kind of historical revisionism, or trying to wrap Dharma up in trigger warnings and safe spaces is going to introduce as much contention as it resolves.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

maybay said:

Buddhism is firstly a refuge from suffering. If people think they can start dumping on everyone else the moment they walk through the door then it ceases to be that refuge.

Malcolm wrote:

We need to understand how Buddhism at present is failing Buddhadharma as a refuge, that is the point. Buddhism and Buddhadharma are two different things.

maybay said:

They need to understand basic decency and give whoever's running the show the benefit of the doubt.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually, the classical texts say the opposite. Students get the benefit of the doubt. Teachers should be held up to rigorous scrutiny.

maybay said:

There's no need to go charging off on some global movement.

Malcolm wrote:
Sure there is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2016 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Empowerments in different yantras

Content:

PuerAzaelis said:

I understand how language is limited to causation. Malcolm, you have just used "result" to try to convey the opposite idea.

But what is the difference between what you have just described as a pointing, and the usual tantric empowerment?

Malcolm wrote:

Tantric empowerments only grant one a conceptual idea. They start with the idea that there are aggregates which in fact need to be transformed into buddha families, for example, like applying an elixir to a base metal to transform it into gold.

Dzogchen starts with the idea that there is nothing to transform, but maybe, one needs to do a little dusting.

PuerAzaelis said:

I've experienced a few of both now.

If both are non-linguistic, what is the difference?

And does this mean I could pick a stranger off the street and she would "get" the pointing out the same as the sangha old timers?

Malcolm wrote:

Who said they are non-linguistic?

In a direct introduction, one either understands what the guru explains, or not. In case of the latter, then there are indirect methods.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2016 at 4:22 AM

Title: Re: Help identifying a star.

Content:

maybay said:

Kalacakra uses the tropical zodiac. The Jyotish system with lunar mansions based on sidereal zodiac is broken.

Malcolm wrote:

The Kalacakra root tantra uses a tropical zodiac, but the Vimalaprabha reintroduced the broken Siddhanta system, which is why the Tibetan calendar is so damn crazy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2016 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

PuerAzelis said:

I understand how language is limited to causation. Malcolm, you have just used "result" to try to convey the opposite idea.

But what is the difference between what you have just described as a pointing, and the usual tantric empowerment?

Malcolm wrote:

Tantric empowerments only grant one a conceptual idea. They start with the idea that there are aggregates which in fact need to be transformed into buddha families, for example, like applying an elixir to a base metal to transform it into gold.

Dzogchen starts with the idea that there is nothing to transform, just something to point out. As Vimalamitra states in Buddhahood in this Life:

If it is objected, "If afflictions are liberated into dharmatā without antidotes, there is no need for purification on the path. Otherwise, liberation would require no effort," for what reason would those who do not understand be liberated? Asserting that those who understand are liberated merely by recognizing concepts as dharmatā is the fruit of one's wishes. As such, in order to recognize that concepts are dharmatā, the intimate instructions of the guru are important.

Supporting this perspective, the Self-Arisen Vidyā Tantra states:

because it exists to be explained,

the result is attained through the explanation.

If not explained, how can there be liberation?

There are no signs in the dharmas of the basis,

no grasping to the dharmas of the path,

and no attainment of the dharmatā of the result.

The basis of sentient beings and the basis of buddhahood
is definitely differentiated by a sole difference.

For what reason is there a sole difference?

Why is it called "the sole difference?"

The basis of buddhahood is pristine consciousness;

the basis of sentient-beinghood is not pristine consciousness.

When both the pristine state (ye) and the consciousness (shes pa) of
it are combined,

it is the sublime transcendent state of the buddhas.

Therefore, what other differences are there?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2016 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Norwegian said:

Crazywisdom,

In Dzogchen there is gzhi, lam, and 'bras bu, in other words base, path, and fruit. This is something Dzogchen teachers teach all the time.

There has to be a base, and a path, and a fruit, because it is a complete path lacking nothing. Otherwise if Dzogchen was only the result, it'd just begin and end with "the fruit", but that's really not the case.

Crazywisdom said:

I know what they say. Im challenging the conceptual regimen. Let's look at your statement. It contains some Tibetan words. Looks so scholarly. But wait, I see a non sequitur: there has to be a base, path and fruit because it is a complete path lacking nothing. This is like poetry, not reasoning.

Then you contradict Malcom, bc he said the result does not arise from a cause. So by his statements the result results the result. There might as well be a result, a result and a result. Because the base, path and result are inseparable, by the terms of that teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

Basis path and result has a different meaning in Dzogchen.

The basis here is not a cause, it is something one did not know.

The path is recognizing what that basis is, based on the teacher's instructions which result in direct perception.

The result is fully experiencing the qualities of that basis.

Thus, Dzogchen is the result that does not arise from a cause.

For example, let us imagine that we are living on an island of gold. But we have no idea what gold is, and so we make various discriminations between things on that island, liking this one, disliking that one, not recognizing their nature is the same.

Someone explains to us what gold is, and then tells us to look past our conceptual discriminations to see what is actually there in our direct perception, i.e., gold.

In the end, when we have ascertained that everything on the island is gold, then we have nothing left to do.

This both what "the result that does not arise from a cause" means, and also what the basis, path and result are in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2016 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This citation comes from one of the Aural Lineages of Vairocana in the the Pellucid Transcendent State of Samantabhadra (Kun tu bzang po dgongs pa zang thal).

There is a reason why Khyentse Wangpo proclaims the Gongpa Zangthal the most profound of all the snying thigs.

amanitamusc said:

There is a commentary in English on Gongpa Zangthal translated by Tulku Thondup Rinpoche.

Crazywisdom said:

It's only about ngondro

Malcolm wrote:

You mean the five nails commentary, yes there is that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2016 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

I thought the 9 yana scheme came up in the terma group. What text is this quote from? For me pith instructions are experiential lessons about the tantras which are taught by the Buddha. They don't come from no where.

Malcolm wrote:

This citation comes from one of the Aural Lineages of Vairocana in the the Pellucid Transcendent State of Samantabhadra (Kun tu bzang po dgongs pa zang thal).

There is a reason why Khyentse Wangpo proclaims the Gongpa Zangthal the most profound of all the snying thigs.

amanitamusc said:

There is a commentary in English on Gongpa Zangthal translated by Tulku Thondup Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

Not exactly.

<http://www.wandel-verlag.de/en/kun-bzang-dgongs-pa-zang-thal-boundless-vision/>

amanitamusc said:

This book contains the Tibetan original text, only in Tibetan language! As appendix it contains an outline of the different chapters contained in the text by Tulku Thondup, in English language. The book has been thoroughly edited and put in chapters following the outline for better accessibility.

Malcolm wrote:

This text is a commentary on a short text in volume 5.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2016 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

It's not a coma bc one can come out of it when one pleases.

Malcolm wrote:

One must be roused from it. Once one enters arhat's final samadhi of cessation, one is stuck in it forever unless a Buddha intervenes.

Crazywisdom said:

The theras have a different way. They say you go into it with the intention to be in that for some period of time. Then one comes out of it at the set time.

Malcolm wrote:

This is while one is still in this life. After an arhat's body breaks up, they enter into a samadhi of cessation that is, for all intents and purposes, a coma, a state of nescience until they are roused from it by a buddha. Thus say many Mahāyāna sūtras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2016 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

I thought the 9 yana scheme came up in the terma group. What text is this quote from? For me pith instructions are experiential lessons about the tantras which are taught by the Buddha. They don't come from no where.

Malcolm wrote:

This citation comes from one of the Aural Lineages of Vairocana in the the Pellucid Transcendent State of Samantabhadra (Kun tu bzang po dgongs pa zang thal).

There is a reason why Khyentse Wangpo proclaims the Gongpa Zangthal the most profound of all the snying thigs.

Crazywisdom said:

So it's from Gonpa Zangthal?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2016 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

This doesn't say what's in the 9, but seems to say, beginning with a direct introduction, a non path begins. And GP is calling it a yana as in Karma Linpa's text.

Tilopa also says the path is no path. I suppose Togal, etc., is in this category outside the vehicle concept. I don't buy that. At minimum it's a quasi-path, bc it has all the markings of a path: something one intends to do for a spiritual purpose, one does a thing, like get into position for that purpose, the path has signposts, the end is clearly marked. If there were a method to go direct to the end, that would be the immediate non-path.

Malcolm wrote:

Śrī Siṃha again states:

The system of the nine yanas assert buddhahood is attained through gathering accumulations and purifying obscurations. The Pellucid Transcendent State of

Samantabhadra asserts that buddhahood cannot be obtained through gathering accumulations and purifying obscurations through samsaric impediments. If one wishes to attain buddhahood, three recognitions are necessary. Those are: the result does not arise from a cause; buddhahood does not arise from mind; intimate instruction do not arise from scriptures.

Crazywisdom said:

I thought the 9 yana scheme came up in the terma group. What text is this quote from? For me pith instructions are experiential lessons about the tantras which are taught by the Buddha. They don't come from no where.

Malcolm wrote:

This citation comes from one of the Aural Lineages of Vairocana in the the Pellucid Transcendent State of Samantabhadra (Kun tu bzang po dgongs pa zang thal).

There is a reason why Khyentse Wangpo proclaims the Gongpa Zangthal the most profound of all the snying thigs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 14th, 2016 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

It's not a coma bc one can come out of it when one pleases.

Malcolm wrote:

One must be roused from it. Once one enters arhat's final samadhi of cessation, one is stuck in it forever unless a Buddha intervenes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2016 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

maybay said:

What is an eon to someone experiencing nirvana?

Malcolm wrote:

What is the difference between this and a coma? Nothing, actually.

Crazywisdom said:

Nirvana is the highest happiness. Coma is a dead mind.

Malcolm wrote:

The samadhi of cessation is a coma, it is a false nirvana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2016 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Anyway the extra secret cycle is also atiyoga. Any path can be categorized. So it's a division of Ati.

Malcolm wrote:

It can be called that, but in general, ati yoga is a category which characterizes the indirect approach through the nine yānas.

Dzogchen stands outside the nine yānas. Śrī Siṃha states:

All Dharmas of the nine yānas are Dharmas of the path, but cannot attain the result. When the pellucid transcendent state (dgongs pa zang thal) of the victors is shown, it is impossible that all sentient beings (to whom it is shown) will not fully awaken

Crazywisdom said:

This doesn't say what's in the 9, but seems to say, beginning with a direct introduction, a non path begins. And GP is calling it a yana as in Karma Linpa's text.

Tilopa also says the path is no path. I suppose Togal, etc., is in this category outside the vehicle concept. I don't buy that. At minimum it's a quasi-path, bc it has all the markings of a path: something one intends to do for a spiritual purpose, one does a thing, like get into position for that purpose, the path has signposts, the end is clearly marked. If there were a method to go direct to the end, that would be the immediate non-path.

Malcolm wrote:

Śrī Siṃha again states:

The system of the nine yanas assert buddhahood is attained through gathering accumulations and purifying obscurations. The Pellucid Transcendent State of Samntabhadra asserts that buddhahood cannot be obtained through gathering accumulations and purifying obscurations through samsaric impediments. If one wishes to attain buddhahood, three recognitions are necessary. Those are: the result does not arise from a cause; buddhahood does not arise from mind; intimate instruction do not arise from scriptures.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2016 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Dzogchen is the result. It's cant be a path.

Malcolm wrote:

No, there is also a Dzogchen path, because it is yāna, and because the basis and the result are different.

Crazywisdom said:

Anyway the extra secret cycle is also atiyoga. Any path can be categorized. So it's a division of Ati.

Malcolm wrote:

It can be called that, but in general, ati yoga is a category which characterizes the indirect approach through the nine yānas.

Dzogchen stands outside the nine yānas. Śrī Siṃha states:

All Dharmas of the nine yānas are Dharmas of the path, but cannot attain the result.

When the pellucid transcendent state (dgongs pa zang thal) of the victors is shown, it is impossible that all sentient beings (to whom it is shown) will not fully awaken

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2016 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are referring to upādāna-skandhas? Anupādāna, non-addictive, simple means that these aggregates are not a cause for future rebirth. There is no implication that they are not regarded as being existent and so on. All that is being implied is that śrāvakas recognize that there is no person (pudgala) in the aggregates and therefore the aggregates are are longer addictive (upādāna).

Astus said:

Upādāna is the support, the fuel, and without it there is nothing to rely on, no burning. Since the aggregates are still there without clinging, at least until complete extinction, it can be said that they exist. On the other hand, because there is no identification nor appropriation (me, mine), there is no reliance on physical or mental appearances, hence no view clung to (diṭṭhupādāna), no attachment to the extreme of existence or non-existence. What is the basis then for any cognitive obscuration?

Malcolm wrote:

Just because there is no view regarding the person, does not mean that there does not still remain views regarding dharmas. Also, as pointed out, Arhats do not realize emptiness free from all four extremes of proliferation. Why? They realize only the emptiness of the person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2016 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, the difference is that Atiyoga is the indirect path; Dzogchen is the direct path.

Crazywisdom said:

Dzogchen is the result. It's cant be a path.

Malcolm wrote:

No, there is also a Dzogchen path, because it is yāna, and because the basis and the result are different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2016 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Not so. When we say that "Arhats realize the selfless of the aggregates," in fact they do not realize the selflessness of the aggregates themselves, rather, only the selflessness of the person imputed on the aggregates.

Astus said:

That is the usual definition of their attainment, that they take the aggregates real but not any self. Or in other words, they differentiate aggregates with attachment and aggregates without attachment, where the latter is considered the final attainment. Now, if they are not attached to the aggregates, then they cannot be attached to any view, because views are concepts, and concepts are within the aggregates.

Malcolm wrote:

You are referring to upādāna-skandhas? Anupādāna, non-addictive, simple means that these aggregates are not a cause for future rebirth. There is no implication that they are not regarded as being existent and so on. All that is being implied is that śrāvakas recognize that there is no person (pudgala) in the aggregates and therefore the aggregates are are longer addictive (upādāna).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2016 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Incorrect question. My assertion is that our present institutions are hierarchical in so far as they maintain a patriarchal hierarchy, which is the present antithesis of equality and freedom.

DGA said:

Very good. Then what would future institutions that do not maintain a patriarchal hierarchy, but do support equal and free participation, look like? how would such institutions function for purposes of Dharma activity?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, for example, we need to ditch the rules that subordinate female ordinands to male ordinands; we need to remove the rules that prevent senior bhikṣunis from acting as full upādhyāyas for men and women alike; we need to eliminate probationary or śikasamana ordination for women ordinands; and this is just a start.

We need a global Buddhist truth and reconciliation movement to openly confront and resolve sexist, racist and classist tropes and images in Buddhism and Buddhist culture.

etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2016 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, the difference is that Atiyoga is the indirect path; Dzogchen is the direct path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2016 at 8:48 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

You made an important qualification though "and that is all you are allowed to do". If a person can extend themselves without shirking their duties, then why not. The problem is that once someone has tasted another life (which with television is inevitable), duty is always going to look like a jail sentence, and they will either leave it undone, work themselves into the ground with duties and study, or they will live hating their duties and themselves. The doctrine being propagandised is one of fundamental inadequacy, the

solution for which is to work harder. Under these conditions Dharma practice is impossible. Balance and contentment are an uphill battle.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this is a certainly a patriarchal approach to Dharma, based on hierarchy and submission, rather than equality and freedom. The former works well for institutions. The later works well for people who wish liberation in this life or the bardo.

DGA said:

This leaves us with the question: what use is there for Dharma institutions of different kinds for the purpose of supporting people who wish liberation in this life or the bardo? (recognizing that the answer to this question may depend on the kind of institution one has in mind, and the needs of those people)

my point is that, in Malcolm's formulation here, institutions and liberation seem to be terms in opposition. is that necessarily so? if not, how not? is it possible to imagine and build Dharma institutions that are nonpatriarchal, democratic, and functional? if so, what would such institutions look like--how would they be organized, &c?

Malcolm wrote:

Incorrect question. My assertion is that our present institutions are hierarchical in so far as they maintain a patriarchal hierarchy, which is the present antithesis of equality and freedom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 13th, 2016 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

You made an important qualification though "and that is all you are allowed to do". If a person can extend themselves without shirking their duties, then why not. The problem is that once someone has tasted another life (which with television is inevitable), duty is always going to look like a jail sentence, and they will either leave it undone, work themselves into the ground with duties and study, or they will live hating their duties and themselves. The doctrine being propagandised is one of fundamental inadequacy, the solution for which is to work harder. Under these conditions Dharma practice is impossible. Balance and contentment are an uphill battle.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this is a certainly a patriarchal approach to Dharma, based on hierarchy and submission, rather than equality and freedom. The former works well for institutions. The later works well for people who wish liberation in this life or the bardo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 8:07 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

Sure. No-one wants to do anyone else's washing up, because, while CEOs are all reading books on "servant leadership", women are being told that washing and cooking for others is a degrading chore, rather than a valuable, dignified, and rewarding experience.

Malcolm wrote:

"...cooking for others is a degrading chore, rather than a valuable, dignified, and rewarding experience" is a degrading chore when that is what your life is confined to, and that is all you are allowed to do. It is "a valuable, dignified, and rewarding experience," when you decide to cook out of choice.

maybay said:

I enjoyed cooking for my tenant very much, and I enjoyed teaching her even more. But eventually she feels [my guess:] that she is getting into debt with me, while she feels challenged to be worthy of such service, and since all she can really do for me personally is the dishes, then it gets too much and she bails out and she decides that while we live together we will not share and care about each other.

Malcolm wrote:

That has everything to do you with, and not much to do with her. As far as I can tell, you are engaged in a lot of projection.

maybay said:

And yet the messages she's getting about the glorious age of women is telling her that that's not OK, that it would be taking a lower role in the hierarch

Malcolm wrote:

No, she is being told that she has choice and agency, and that men need to participate more in the unpaid, unrecognized labor of maintaining a home.

maybay said:

The problem with this new situation is they will have to work harder and earn a greater salary to enjoy such independence, and for that they must submit themselves to a bloody-minded system that couldn't care less about their individuality, which ironically is not a problem for women.

Malcolm wrote:

More sexist silliness. It makes me seriously question whether you understand that women are human beings also.

maybay said:

The problem for women was never a lack of independence. It was being different from

other women, ie jealousy.

Malcolm wrote:

Even more sexist silliness.

maybay said:

The problem for men is that the bloody-minded system is strengthened by women's independence from their local communities, and it becomes even more bloody-minded against individuals and local cultures...which then becomes a problem for women.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahaha, this is even more sexist silliness.

maybay said:

The result is a work environment that is so inhospitable as to be a factory of pathological behaviour.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, Roger Ailes.

maybay said:

And so while women emancipate themselves out of love and into what is effectively an Arhat-like existence,

Malcolm wrote:

Huh?

maybay said:

we have growing social discontent, and corporate and political malfeasance caused by morons that puts everyone at risk.

Malcolm wrote:

And walla, we have a total non-sequitor posing as rationality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 7:58 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Vajrayana is the best and it's all Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I agree. It is a matter of differences in approach.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 5:54 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Btw, it is often not understood, especially by people coming from gsar ma backgrounds, like cloudburst, that Atiyoga of the nine yānas is one thing, but the Great Perfection is in fact something else, beyond Atiyoga.

DGA said:

Malcolm, would it be possible for you to elaborate on this point a bit for the purpose of clear discussion? i.e., what is the content of this distinction between Dzogchen and Atiyoga?

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN discusses this in Crystal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 5:47 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Astus said:

Since all appearances that occur are one of the five aggregates and six areas, there cannot be anything an arhat grasps as self or belonging to a self. Furthermore, belief in any kind of substance can occur only in the aggregates, and since no aggregate is grasped, no view can be grasped either.

Malcolm wrote:

Not so. When we say that "Arhats realize the selfless of the aggregates," in fact they do not realize the selflessness of the aggregates themselves, rather, only the selflessness of the person imputed on the aggregates. Gorampa points out:

Now then, if it is thought that one will be able to give up the grasping true existence of grasping the true existence in the aggregates with the unimpeded path of the śrāvakas, since apprehending the non-existence of true existence of the aggregates is not the main point, but apprehending the non-existence of the true existence of the person is the main point, there is no error. Likewise, since apprehending the non-existence of the true existence of the apprehended outer objects is the main point of the unimpeded path of the path of seeing of the pratyekabuddhas, it is possible to give up the grasping true existence of grasping the true existence in outer apprehended objects, but it is not

possible to give up the knowledge obscuration beyond that.

Because apprehending the freedom from proliferation of the four extremes with the unimpeded path of the path of seeing of Mahāyāna is the main point, that is the point of being able to give up all knowledge obscurations.

...

In brief, primary object of realization of śrāvakas is the selflessness of the person but that realization grasps true existence in the aggregates. It is necessary to reject [such grasping to true existence] because grasping true existence of grasping the true existence in the aggregates has the unimpeded power to cause the actual grasping to the self of persons. The primary object of realization of pratyekabuddhas is [42/b] the non-existence of true existence in apprehended outer objects. Because the primary object of realization of Mahāyāna is freedom from all proliferations of dualistic grasping, the difference in views are vast.

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.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Btw, it is often not understood, especially by people coming from gsar ma backgrounds, like cloudburst, that Atiyoga of the nine yānas is one thing, but the Great Perfection is in fact something else, beyond Atiyoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

Justice What has this got to do with Dharma?

daelm said:

neither Malcolm nor I were speaking about justice. we're explaining how structural misogyny works. if you remember, this was in response to the original example that you

took so much offence to. hope it clarified.

maybay said:

If you want to give an example of institutional misogyny to try persuade people against it you should choose a relationship that ends in ruin, like so many of today's patriarchy-free relationships. You've chosen a relationship where everyone came out the other end enlightened.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, these relationships about which you speak that end in failure, are ending in failure because the pillar upon which patriarchy is founded, controlling women's access to education, etc., is crumbling.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 5:14 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

anjali said:

Here is how it is explained by Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche in As It Is, V2:

Astus said:

That is the same definition as in the Uttaratantra Shastra, and it can go back further to Yogacara's grasper/subject and grasped/object. An arhat that does not grasp at the aggregates cannot have those subtle concepts either. Primarily, because there is no attachment to concepts. Secondly, because an arhat has realised the lack of self, and without an owner/grasper there can be no owned/grasped either.

Malcolm wrote:

Arhats realize selfness of the aggregates only, they do not realize the selflessness of all phenomena because the aggregates do not include all phenomena, but only afflicted conditioned phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Astus said:

...knowledge of all modes does not come from lack of clinging.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Astus said:

Yes it does come from lack of clinging? Or yes, there is a different cause? If the latter,

what is it?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it does not come from a lack of clinging.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 5:12 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

it is well known among Dzogchen practitioners that much of the war and conflict we experience in this age arises as a result of conflict between mamos.

maybay said:

Maybe there's a supernatural explanation for patriarchy too.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe, but I doubt it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Astus said:

By the way, Shakyamuni tasted neither.

Malcolm wrote:

Sadly, he lived before the Columbian exchange.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Astus said:

...knowledge of all modes does not come from lack of clinging.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

They don't stop at that because they don't account for the appearances of kayas. This pristine cognition resembles the frozen states you deride.

Malcolm wrote:

Not sure I understand what you are attempting to say.

Crazywisdom said:

Resting in the space like pristine awareness is not the dharmakaya, because the appearance of the form kaya has to appear spontaneously if there is resting in dharmakaya. And this does not happen in a mere pristine cognition which is like a glaring motionless light. The tantras do arrive at dharmakaya because they don't dispense with mental body forms.

Malcolm wrote:

I only stated that where these three systems agreed was on one point. Where they part is based on their respective paths. For example, familiarity through 32 examples presented in the view of the inseparability of samsara and nirvana, i.e., resting in a moment of unfabricated consciousness (shes pa ma bcos pa), ordinary consciousness (tha mal gyi shes pa), or connate pristine consciousness (lhan gcig skye ye shes), is a necessary prerequisite in the system of Lamdre before one even embarks on creation and completion stage meditations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, they cannot be. There is no practice of thögal in any gsar ma system.

Astus said:

I said that the listed features can be true for Mahamudra as well.

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[For example, it is well known among Dzogchen practitioners that much of the war and conflict we experience in this age arises as a result of conflict between mamos.

kirtu said:

And I have been meaning to ask this for some time: how can we pacify these mamos?

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

One has to get in touch with their bosses, Palden Lhamo, Ekajati, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 3:53 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

Well, i think super technology is a fact, (not based on science fiction of alien hypothesis), but true exchanges made by government & aliens, as we allow them to abduct humans for their own experimentation...and they know how greedy we are for technology, so this is how we do business with them.

Malcolm wrote:

Guns and whiskey, huh?

Crazywisdom said:

My ex went to Lhasa. Her impression, "Whoa. It's super sci fi."

Malcolm wrote:

I've been to Lhasa. My impression? "Wow, a lot of Chinese cops."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Saraha's Dohas can be understood as a path. They speak of methods, devaluing some and tangentially pointing toward others.

Malcolm wrote:

Kagyü Mahāmudra, Trekchö, the view of the inseparability of samsara and nirvana, etc., all have the same point: resting in a moment of unfabricated consciousness. Dzogchen

goes beyond this point, that's all.

Crazywisdom said:

They don't stop at that because they don't account for the appearances of kayas. This pristine cognition resembles the frozen states you deride.

Malcolm wrote:

Not sure I understand what you are attempting to say.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This does not follow at all.

Astus said:

How so? If one grasps at concepts, that is identifying with at least some mental aggregates. If no mental phenomena is attached to, where can be any cognitive obscuration?

Malcolm wrote:

Absence of attachment does indicate absence of cognitive obscuration. For example, one may have no attachment to chocolate, and nevertheless be ignorant of the flavor of coffee. Likewise, arhats may be free of gross attachment to the three realms, but they are ignorance of all modes of awakening, among other things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Kagyu Mahāmudra, Trekchö, the view of the inseparability of samsara and nirvana, etc., all have the same point: resting in a moment of unfabricated consciousness. Dzogchen goes beyond this point, that's all.

Astus said:

In what way does it go beyond? For instance, the seven distinguishing features of thogal (Treasury of Precious Qualities, vol 2, p 269) can be valid for Mahamudra as well.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they cannot be. There is no practice of thögal in any gsar ma system. It does not exist. If you think so, it merely shows you have read something you do not understand, which you should not read, and for which you should find competent instruction if you

do want to read it. Otherwise, you will just be another Kim Katami.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Coëmgenu said:

What if the white people in question are neither American nor Anglo?

I'll drop the subject now though. It's not something important enough to warrant getting into a longer disagreement over.

Malcolm wrote:

It is just kind of stupid for non-Tibetans to adopt Tibetan names, as if it changes anything about them.

tiagolps said:

Like a tibetan calling himself John, Bob or Francisco...

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Coëmgenu said:

I reject this ideology you espouse, that white people should stick to "normal" Anglo-American sounding names full-heartedly.

Malcolm wrote:

Have to agree with Nathan on this one.

Coëmgenu said:

What if the white people in question are neither American nor Anglo?

I'll drop the subject now though. It's not something important enough to warrant getting into a longer disagreement over.

Malcolm wrote:

It is just kind of stupid for non-Tibetans to adopt Tibetan names, as if it changes

anything about them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there is a difference; arhats possess non-afflictive ignorance. Buddha's don't. But if arhats want to realize Mahāyāna buddhahood, they must begin at the beginning, since they lack both accumulations.

Astus said:

Arhats cannot have cognitive obscuration, because that would mean attachment to mental aggregates.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not follow at all. This is like asserting that first stage bodhisattvas cannot have cognitive obscurations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

Well, i think super technology is a fact, (not based on science fiction of alien hypothesis), but true exchanges made by government & aliens, as we allow them to abduct humans for their own experimentation...and they know how greedy we are for technology, so this is how we do business with them.

Malcolm wrote:

Guns and whiskey, huh?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

It just looks so stupid when white folks go by Tibetan names...

Coëmgenu said:

I reject this ideology you espouse, that white people should stick to "normal" Anglo-American sounding names full-heartedly.

Malcolm wrote:
Have to agree with Nathan on this one.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 2:19 AM
Title: Re: Difference in attainments
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
It is also true that the samadhi of cessation is not a true liberation.

maybay said:
Where is this explained?

Malcolm wrote:
The conduct that grasps nonattachment
is the conduct of the vehicle of characteristics—
śrāvakas, pratyekabuddhas and bodhisattvas.
In reality, they are bound by great attachment.
— The Tantra of the Clear Dimension

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 2:15 AM
Title: Re: Difference in attainments
Content:
maybay said:
What is an eon to someone experiencing nirvana?

Malcolm wrote:
What is the difference between this and a coma? Nothing, actually.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 2:07 AM
Title: Re: Difference in attainments
Content:

kirtu said:
It is true that their activity for sentient beings is cut while they are in nirvana. So their personal experience of peace is not much for all the others after death.

Malcolm wrote:
It is also true that the samadhi of cessation is not a true liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: Phurba Practices?

Content:

pemachophel said:

Sherab Dorje,

You forgot to mention to the OP that, before doing Vajrakilaya (Yidam) practice, one typically has to finish ngondro.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, that very much depends on your teacher. For example, it is the system of Sakyapas to practice either Kilaya or Vajrapani before starting your ngondro, to remove obstacles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Aliens (split from "Patriarchy in Vajrayāna")

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So for you the First Noble Truth is: Existence is suffering and it is caused by aliens?

And what's the deal with those poor aliens always being on the wrong end of the stick? I mean why doesn't anybody ever say: Aliens are to blame for all our positive characteristics. It is because aliens control us telepathically and through implants that we display kindness, compassion, etc... No! The aliens are always the baddies!

Kunga Lhadzom said:

There are MANY different types of Aliens. Look at all the BILLIONS of galaxies "out there" (or is it ALL in our MIND ?)

Buddha, IMO, was trying to help us. He KNEW the truth. He knew how fragile the human mind was/is. He was trying to help us be in control of our own mind.

I'm still not done watching the video....

Malcolm wrote:

It is possible for nonhuman beings, called gdon in Tibetan, and also mi ma yin, literally nonhumans, to influence and interfere with humans. The problem with the alien hypothesis is that it is based on science fiction notion of the universe involving a super technology and so on. But that is not necessary to account for your intuition that physical events and beings on this planet are being controlled or interfered with. For example, it is well known among Dzogchen practitioners that much of the war and conflict we experience in this age arises as a result of conflict between mamos.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Saraha's Dohas can be understood as a path. They speak of methods, devaluing some and tangentially pointing toward others.

Malcolm wrote:

Kagyu Mahāmudra, Trekchö, the view of the inseparability of samsara and nirvana, etc., all have the same point: resting in a moment of unfabricated consciousness. Dzogchen goes beyond this point, that's all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

kirtu said:

So from a note to the Uttaratantra & commentary by Jamgon Kongtrul and Khenpo Tseltrim Gyamtso, it is definitely asserted that Arhats attain the beginning of the 7th Bhumi upon arousal.

t

Malcolm wrote:

Gorampa disputes this point in his Differentiation of Views:

Moreover if it is inquired “If it is not possible to abandon the knowledge obscurations below the seventh stage, what object to give up would a śrāvaka Arhat entering the Mahāyāna path give up at the seventh stage?” It will be necessary to hide one’s head under a fur coat.

Some, wishing to avoid that error, claim “Śrāvaka Arhats enter from the eighth stage”, which is a truly inferior standpoint. If that were so, in order to accomplish Buddhahood from the very beginning it would be quicker to enter the śrāvaka path than the Mahāyāna path, since the latter must take wait two incalculable eons before attaining the eighth bodhisattva stage while the former can attain the state of an Arhat in three lifetimes through rapid effort, and afterwards it would then be sufficient to enter on the eighth stage. Also this appears to be a belittling affront to Mahāyāna

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Aliens (split from "Patriarchy in Vajrayāna")

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

According to the Mahāyāna sūtras, arhats and pratyekabuddha are eventually roused out of their samadhi of cessation, and inducted as beginners on the Mahāyāna path.

Sherab Dorje said:

Yup, having been lapped by us oh-so-compassionate-and-awakened Mahayana practitioners not only do they have to run the whole journey from the beginning, they have to do it twice to catch up with us...

Malcolm wrote:

The merit of an unawakened Mahāyāni is infinite compared to the merit of an arhat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:

This thread paints arhatship as quietism, unless I misunderstand.

Knowing peace, being unmoved by anything, one therefore does not rise to compassionate activity for the sake of other beings.

Is this a fair assessment?

Malcolm wrote:

Arhats, when they pass away, enter into a samadhi of cessation. This is not actually liberation, from a Mahāyāna POV.

Monlam Tharchin said:

What happens next, if it is not liberation? Rebirth once the conditions of this samadhi are exhausted?

Malcolm wrote:

According to the Mahāyāna sūtras, arhats and pratyekabuddha are eventually roused out of their samadhi of cessation, and inducted as beginners on the Mahāyāna path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Aliens (split from "Patriarchy in Vajrayāna")

Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
You are frakin' joking, right?

Malcolm wrote:
No, I don't think she is.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, September 11th, 2016 at 12:12 AM
Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:
Virgo said:
What's the use of attaining peace? There is no activity for sentient beings that way. It is useless from our Mahayana perspective aside from being a field of merit for others while the arhat etc lives. So much more precious to develop the true heart. There is nothing in peace.

Malcolm wrote:
Indeed.

Monlam Tharchin said:
This thread paints arhatship as quietism, unless I misunderstand.
Knowing peace, being unmoved by anything, one therefore does not rise to compassionate activity for the sake of other beings.
Is this a fair assessment?

Malcolm wrote:
Arhats, when they pass away, enter into a samadhi of cessation. This is not actually liberation, from a Mahāyāna POV.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 11:36 PM
Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:
Malcolm 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: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 10:58 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Crazywisdom said:
And yet Saraha propagated tantras.

Malcolm wrote:
At least one of them did.

Crazywisdom said:
Tilopa got every Tantra and completion practice and dumped it all on Naropa. Wasn't he a chakrasmvara author?

Malcolm wrote:
The person who, according to tradition, first revealed the Laghusamvara Tantra was Saraha I, Siddha Nāgarjuna's teacher. Luipa wrote the first sadhana of this tradition.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 10:14 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?
Content:

Crazywisdom said:
And yet Saraha propagated tantras.

Malcolm wrote:
At least one of them did.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 10:14 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
No, the citations miss the point.

Sherab Dorje said:
I fail to see how. Could you please explain?

Malcolm wrote:
Astus does not understand the point I am making, therefore, his citations miss the point.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 10:12 PM
Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

florin said:

Those who practice tantra inside dzogchen transmission are able to see and experience the manifestation of the visualization as the rolpa energy of the primordial wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:

Intellectually.

florin said:

"... jf we do not understand that the whole of samsara and nirvana is the Rolpa (energy manifestation) of our vision, even jf we declare that we have discovered our Rigpa, know that it does not correspond to the real meaning because Knowledge means understanding and having the certainty that samsara and nirvana in the absolute are the na-ture of primordial purity. And since the view is also nothing other than this be sure to ascertain this profound point! "

Do you think that your teacher was talking here about intellectual understanding then ?

Malcolm wrote:

It is very possible to have an intellectual understanding of this point without having real knowledge of this point, and remain in that intellectual understanding rather than moving beyond it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...but it really is missing the point.

Sherab Dorje said:

Virupa and Saraha are missing the point?

Malcolm wrote:

No, the citations miss the point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What in fact that Dzogchen tradition rejects is that the two stages are needed at all. They can be used if desired, but they are not necessary.

Astus said:

Mahamudra works without them as well.

"Still others just meditate on mandala circles,
Some are fixed in explaining the purport of the fourth,
For some [reality] is conceptually visualized as space,
Still others would have [reality] possess emptiness.
In general they are fixed in contradiction."

(Ornamental Flower for the Dohas, v 45–49, Dreaming the Great Brahmin, p 136)

"No tantra, no mantra, nothing to meditate on,
no meditative concentration.
These all are causes which delude your ego.
Do not corrupt your mind, whose nature is pure,
with meditative concentrations.
Station the true self in bliss, and cause it no torment.
Basking in eating, drink, and sex
Fills the nodes again and again,
Through such a teaching, the ends of the earth are reached";
Stamp down such deluded defenders of the world
and move on.
Those in whom the breath and mind do not move,
And the sun and moon are uninvolved,
Ignorant ones, you must rest your breath.
Saraha has taught all instructions and gone away."
(v 95–106, p 141-142)

Malcolm wrote:

The Mahāmudra described here is not a path, it's a state of realization. Virupa and other mahāsiddhas express identical sentiments, but it really is missing the point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Astus said:

Interestingly, if we compare the early teachings where one has to be free from identification with the aggregates, and teachings on the obscurations in Mahayana that block one from attaining buddhahood, it turns out that there should be no difference at all between arhats and buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there is a difference; arhats possess non-afflictive ignorance. Buddha's don't. But if arhats want to realize Mahāyāna buddhahood, they must begin at the beginning, since they lack both accumulations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...If you want to learn what this means, find a real Dzogchen master.

Sherab Dorje said:

Recruiting in the Mahamudra sub-forum are we?

Malcolm wrote:

Someone asked what the difference was.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 9:15 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Vasana said:

You can still apply Dzogchen view to the other practices.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but nevertheless, this still working with mind. It is not the main point.

florin said:

Those who practice tantra inside dzogchen transmission are able to see and experience the manifestation of the visualization as the rolpa energy of the primordial wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:

Intellectually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 12:34 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Arhats, lacking Mahāyana bodhicitta begin at the beginning of the Mahāyāna path of accumulation. Otherwise, arhatship would be a shortcut to buddhahood. But it is not.

Virgo said:

What's the use of attaining peace? There is no activity for sentient beings that way. It is useless from our Mahayana perspective aside from being a field of merit for others while the arhat etc lives. So much more precious to develop the true heart. There is nothing in peace.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 12:16 PM

Title: Re: Difference in attainments

Content:

Astus said:

How do arahants progress to the mahayana path after attaining Nirvana?

They start on the 6th/7th bhumi.

It should also be remembered that arhats in Mahayana mainly represent those practitioners who think that annihilation is the solution, and they mistake meditative peace for enlightenment. That's why they need to be waken up from their false nirvana to continue the path.

Malcolm wrote:

Arhats, lacking Mahāyana bodhicitta begin at the beginning of the Mahāyāna path of accumulation. Otherwise, arhatship would be a shortcut to buddhahood. But it is not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 10:38 AM

Title: Re: Colorado's anti-fracking measures didn't make the ballot

Content:

Lobsang Chojor said:

Is the economy not dependent on the environment?

Rakz said:

It is dependent on exploiting it unfortunately.

Malcolm wrote:

It is then not sustainable. To exploit something is to use it beyond its capacity to sustain itself. If we use the environment beyond its capacity to sustain itself, the economy that depends on such an environment will collapse when the environment it has destroyed collapses. This is the lesson of the rise and fall of world civilizations since we have had records with which to track these things.

We, sadly, have learned nothing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 10:25 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

tiagolps said:

I'd like to know, has anyone ever witnessed or been the victim of misogyny in shangas here in the west? Or anywhere else?

Malcolm wrote:

I have observed it repeatedly amongst men in Sanghas since I started studying with Tibetan Lamas. That said, I have observed misogyny everywhere I have traveled and lived all my life since I was aware that there was systematic dehumanization of women by men. So I don't think it is a problem specific to Vajrayāna, merely that the context of Vajrayāna is patriarchal. Men in particular are largely unconscious of it. When it is brought to their attention they often spend a lot of time a) in denial while continuing to treat women like shit and b) becoming reactionary, trying to justify tropes in Vajrayāna because they have brainwashed themselves into objectifying their religion as being something more than a narrative, a story.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 10:23 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Coëmgenu said:

Edit: it just occurred to me that the gendering-fetishization of noun classes 'into' genders is the very same patriarchy this thread is about.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, which was the point of my bringing up the fact that prajñā has all three genders when the issue was raised.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 10:21 AM

Title: Re: Michael James on Ramana

Content:

dreambow said:

Many people find Ramana Maharshi inspirational.

Malcolm wrote:

Great. Let them find him inspirational on the nonduality forum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 10:15 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

cloudburst said:

It is interesting that this is being cited as support for the idea that there was a movement denying the importance of generation stage. To me it reads as an unequivocal statement in support of the need for generation stage, if there is to be a completion stage.

Kindly clarify your understanding please?

Malcolm wrote:

The reason why this debate exists in this tantra is because it reflects a debate on the ground in the 8th century between the Indian forbears of the Dzogchen tradition, Śrī Siṃha et al and other Indians invested in the formal process of what we have come to refer, in blanket terms, as the stages of creation and completion. The passage itself favors those Indians who favored the formal process of the two stages. But the mere fact that the question exists in this tantra (which emerged following the era in which Śrī Siṃha and co. lived) proves that this was a significant debate in Indian Vajrayāna circles as a relatively early time.

But the creation and completion stages, as envisioned for example in the system of Sakya Lamdre or Naro Khachöma, is completely irrelevant to Dzogchen theory and practice. There is simply no need to go through the conceptual exercise of transforming one's aggregates, sense bases and elements in a mandala of deities, nor is there any need to work with karma vāyus, or relative nāḍis and bindus in the manner of the various completion stage systems such as those found in Lamdre, the Six Dharmas of Naropa, etc.

It is for this reason that tantras like Hevajra are considered provisional in Dzogchen teachings.

What in fact that Dzogchen tradition rejects is that the two stages are needed at all. They can be used if desired, but they are not necessary. Further, another consequence of this is that yogas derived from so called "completion stage" repertoire can be used without needing to engage in creation at all.

There is simply no need at all, from a Dzogchen perspective, to engage in the conceptual exercise of substituting pure vision for impure vision when in fact the vision of pristine consciousness is constantly available to anyone to perceive at any time at all providing they have the proper instructions. If you want to learn what this means, find a real Dzogchen master.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 9:58 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, when we talk about the path of Dzogchen, it goes beyond this inert kind of emptiness of which you are so fond.

cloudburst said:

no such thing, no actual Buddhist school posits an inert emptiness, this is a philosophers fantasy

Malcolm wrote:

Astus does.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

cloudburst said:

The Dalai Lama says Dzogchen is called Maha-ati because one practices mahayoga and ati together unless one is a Tilopa or Padmasambhava, a genuine chigcarwa.

Malcolm wrote:

This a characteristically Sarma way of understanding things. This is not according to the system of Dzogchen itself.

cloudburst said:

This is really just a result of how the pie is sliced. Actual Mahamudra is also beyond cause and result, so if we classified HYT and Mahamudra the way the Nine yana system is set up, we would divide HYT into maha and anu and Mahamudra would correspond to Dzogchen

Malcolm wrote:

HYT does not go beyond mahāyoga. There is nothing that corresponds to anuyoga and atiyoga in gsar ma tantra.

From the point of view of Dzogchen, this is a deviation of the lower vehicles.

Same from the point of view of actual mahamudra. From this pov, there is no cause and result.

The state of Mahāmudra, Dzogchen, and Prajñāpāramitā is the same state. What distinguishes these are their respective paths. Unlike Mahāmudra and Prajñāpāramita, the actual path of Dzogchen itself is beyond cause and result.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Colorado's anti-fracking measures didn't make the ballot

Content:

Lobsang Chojor said:

The sad thing is regulation is difficult because companies won't say what the fracking liquid is citing corporate secrets.

Malcolm wrote:

It is all poison. That is why they won't say.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Michael James on Ramana

Content:

florin said:

I have been listening to his talks on Ramana for a while and i found them very interesting and informative.

Here is a biography of him http://www.happinessofbeing.com/michael_james.html

And here one of a recording <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rToxPytMgaQ>

anjali said:

Hi florin. Is there something specific in those links that you believe to be of relevance for a Buddhist forum? Unless there is something specific you have in mind, perhaps material like this might be best posted to the relatively new <http://dharmapaths.com/forum/>

florin said:

Whatever it is in those links it could be beneficial to some individuals in this forum but not necessarily to the forum in general.

This is lounge and here as you can see people post all kinds of things.

Before writing anything further, I would first like to emphasise that this website is not about me as a person, but is about the real 'me', which is the absolute reality, the one fundamental, essential, immutable, infinite, undivided and non-dual consciousness of our own being, which we each experience as 'I am'.

Malcolm wrote:

http://www.happinessofbeing.com/michael_james.html

This is an absolute fail.

Countless views of a self are included in two. Those are included in both the eternalist view and the annihilationist view. Countless views of self come from those two.

—— Self-Arisen Vidyā Tantra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

conebeckham said:

If one engages in KyeRim, for instance, which is mind-based, but with one's Awareness of the Nature permeating all mental activities, is that a deviation, in the Dzogchen system?

Malcolm wrote:

If you think any mind based activity will result in buddhahood, it is a deviation from a Dzogchen POV.

conebeckham said:

Thus, for one who practices Dzogchen, deity practices are either deviations--if one understands those practices to be means toward Buddhahood--or not, if one practices with other "goals" or "mundane needs" in mind?

Malcolm wrote:

Mipham explains it well, in his commentary on Mañjuśrimitra's Meditation of Awakened Mind:

If it is asked, "What is the method of realizing the definitive meaning through the indirect method?," since nonactivity is illustrated with the activity of fabricated efforts, like pointing to the moon with the finger, also awakened mind correctly grasped through a symbol will accomplish awakening, because the Bhagavan Buddha, the teacher of devas and humans, has declared that it is "great awakening." Any unfortunate one who conceptualizes entities should make efforts in the indirect method of realization. This unfortunate one is anyone who has not discovered vidyā, or has difficulty doing so.

And:

If one meditates generating the thought that the samadhis and the mudras are dharmaṭā, and therefore are not different, the ultimate awakened mind arises from that. If one actualizes the meditation, one realizes that all phenomena do not exist apart from one's mind. The accumulations are gathered and obscurations are purified because of that meditation. One becomes realized through one's continuum being blessed by the deity of pristine consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Others believe that practice is the means and Mahamudra is the result, which is not a wrong view, per se, either.

Malcolm wrote:

From the point of view of Dzogchen, this is a deviation of the lower vehicles.

conebeckham said:

If one engages in KyeRim, for instance, which is mind-based, but with one's Awareness of the Nature permeating all mental activities, is that a deviation, in the Dzogchen system?

Malcolm wrote:

If you think any mind based activity will result in buddhahood, it is a deviation from a Dzogchen POV.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Prajñā is masculine, feminine and neuter.

Sherab Dorje said:

Is that grammatically possible in Sanskrit? Coz in Greek it is not.

Are there many Sanskrit words with this characteristic?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Others believe that practice is the means and Mahamudra is the result, which is not a wrong view, per se, either.

Malcolm wrote:

From the point of view of Dzogchen, this is a deviation of the lower vehicles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

MiphamFan said:

So even magic from other traditions is OK? Hindu tantra, Kabbalah, Egyptian magic, ATR stuff (except where it involves animal sacrifice)?

Malcolm wrote:

If you are sufficiently bored, sure.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Astus said:

I doubt that. Intelligence/rationality is associated with masculinity by modern Westerners, not ancient Asians.

Sherab Dorje said:

Ironically gnosis (knowledge), sofia (wisdom), dianoia (intellectual brilliance) and logiki (rationality) are all feminine nouns in the Greek language...

dzogchungpa said:

Not to mention prajñā.

Malcolm wrote:

Prajñā is masculine, feminine and neuter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is because they are teaching Mahāmudra as a goal. Dzogchen (and actual Mahāmudra) is not a goal.

Sherab Dorje said:

Nope. They are not teaching that the goal of the practice is to achieve Mahamudra, they teach that all practice IS Mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, what the Mahāsiddhas state is that everything is mahāmudra, it has nothing to do with whether one practices or not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Well, I would interpret that they are teaching Mahamudra as a path. I agree it is not a "goal," but based on perspective, it may be seen as one.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāmudra is generally approached as a goal to be realized through gathering the two accumulations and so on, no?

conebeckham said:

No.

Not in my experience--though of course, there is a presentation of Mahamudra as "fruition," and gathering the two accumulations, etc., as path practices, along with pretty much every other practice one can engage in, including the two stages, leads to a "goal," there is also a way of understanding Mahamudra as "Ground" and "Path."

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I understand the presentation to which you refer, but simply put, Mahāmudra is on a cause and result continuum or it isn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Vasana said:

You can still apply Dzogchen view to the other practices.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but nevertheless, this still working with mind. It is not the main point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Okay, that is the point that needed clarification.

My teachers, so far, teach that all practice is ultimately Mahamudra practice.

Malcolm wrote:

This is because they are teaching Mahāmudra as a goal. Dzogchen (and actual Mahāmudra) is not a goal.

conebeckham said:

Well, I would interpret that they are teaching Mahamudra as a path. I agree it is not a

"goal," but based on perspective, it may be seen as one.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāmudra is generally approached as a goal to be realized through gathering the two accumulations and so on, no?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 1:02 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, when they are practicing HYT practices, they are not practicing Dzogchen.

Sherab Dorje said:

Okay, that is the point that needed clarification.

My teachers, so far, teach that all practice is ultimately Mahamudra practice.

Malcolm wrote:

This is because they are teaching Mahāmudra as a goal. Dzogchen (and actual Mahāmudra) is not a goal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but that depends on the power of your siddhi. So I would not give up that day job just yet, Astus.

Astus said:

So it's the fault of the user if it doesn't work. How convenient.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as with everything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Astus said:

Is it possible to exchange one's 8 hours job for a 30 mins prosperity ritual but maintain

the same income level? Might need a new topic for that perhaps.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but that depends on the power of your siddhi. So I would not give up that day job just yet, Astus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

IOS and OS X are not the same thing.

Astus said:

That's OK. I'm simply asking about those other special methods that work in all walks of life, like fixing IT problems. Practising patience is of course beneficial, but the machine cares not about your state of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

You will note I excluded IT problems. I also do not know of any mantras that can fix other inert things such as pots, wheels and so on, because they are inert.

Practices for healing, prosperity, increasing harvests and so on are abundant and useful since they relate to things that are alive, and not inert.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: Empowerment Question

Content:

sangyey said:

Which empowerment?

Trekcho

Malcolm wrote:

There is no "empowerment" for trekchö. Trekchö actually means one understands the meaning of Dzogchen directly.

Do you mean you received direct introduction?

In any case, in order to practice some deity, you need the lung of the mantra and the description of the deity, instructions on how to practice and what to do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But they are, and are one of the reasons we have many methods of dealing with health, financial and other kinds of obstacles in the Vajrayāna tradition that Dzogchen practitioners can use as they see fit. If you get a Mac, you won't have computer problems, apart from hardware failures.

Astus said:

Really? Do you know a mantra perhaps for the problems caused by the current IOS upgrade on Apple devices? Could help a lot of people.

Malcolm wrote:

IOS and OS X are not the same thing.

Astus said:

If it is a method that is sufficient for liberation, why use anything else?

Malcolm wrote:

That's up to the individual person to decide for themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

I get this, but it gets confusing when Dzogchen practitioners regularly make use of HYT practices..

Malcolm wrote:

Well, when they are practicing HYT practices, they are not practicing Dzogchen.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Simple enough I guess.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, when someone who is a Dzogchen practitioner is using methods such as deity yoga, they are using mind to try and go beyond mind. This is a valid approach. However, actual Dzogchen practice means you have already understood what it means to go beyond mind, and have left that kind of practice behind as a path. At that point,

practices involving mind are used to gather accumulations, deal with illness and obstacles, and so on, for example the practice of Sang offerings is useful with there are problems with local guardians and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

What differentiates practitioners of Mahamudra or HYT from Dzogchenpa, view, practice, both?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, Mahāmudra proper, like Dzogchen, is a path of self-liberation.

But in general, HYT is a result vehicle, where as Dzogchen is the vehicle beyond cause and result.

This is the simplest way to put it.

Johnny Dangerous said:

I get this, but it gets confusing when Dzogchen practitioners regularly make use of HYT practices..

Malcolm wrote:

Well, when they are practicing HYT practices, they are not practicing Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Empowerment Question

Content:

sangyey said:

I received a Dzoghcen empowerment and I was wondering since it is Highest Yoga Tantra if I can practice other deity practices without having to get their empowerment?

Thank you.

Malcolm wrote:

Which empowerment?

But in general, you can practice any deity for which you have the mantra lung and the description of the practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

What differentiates practitioners of Mahamudra or HYT from Dzogchenpa, view, practice, both?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, Mahāmudra proper, like Dzogchen, is a path of self-liberation.

But in general, HYT is a result vehicle, where as Dzogchen is the vehicle beyond cause and result.

This is the simplest way to put it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 10th, 2016 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

let us say you are a Dzogchen practitioner, but you have a problem with alcohol. ... Let is say that you have a clear sign your life force is dwindling, then you might want to resort to various methods of cheating death and prolonging life.

Astus said:

Those issues are not related to the bodhisattva path. I wouldn't consider health, financial, or computer problems appropriately solvable with Buddhist methods, nor should they be seen as such.

Malcolm wrote:

But they are, and are one of the reasons we have many methods of dealing with health, financial and other kinds of obstacles in the Vajrayāna tradition that Dzogchen practitioners can use as they see fit. If you get a Mac, you won't have computer problems, apart from hardware failures.

Astus said:

the actual path of Dzogchen is never based on concepts and mind
That's great. No ideation, no self, no suffering. And that's why I raised the question about the need for doing anything else.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Well, when we talk about the path of Dzogchen, it goes beyond this inert kind of emptiness of which you are so fond.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Because people have relative circumstances.

Astus said:

What do you mean by that? Is Dzogchen not sufficient, or is it functional only for some people?

Malcolm wrote:

Astus, for example, let us say you are a Dzogchen practitioner, but you have a problem with alcohol. In order to overcome that problem, you might adopt the pratimokṣa vows until you overcome that problem.

Let us say that you have a clear sign your life force is dwindling, then you might want to resort to various methods of cheating death and prolonging life.

Dzogchen practitioners can use various methods in order to overcome problems that arise because of impure vision and karma, but the actual path of Dzogchen is never based on concepts and mind, unlike mahāyoga and anuyoga, and the rest of the Buddhist and non-Buddhist vehicles. This is all very straight forward and explained at length in the primary literature of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is a garuda that feasts on the naḡas of the incorrect views of the eight lower vehicles.

Sherab Dorje said:

I preferred the cannibal analogy.

Malcolm wrote:

You would.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

can practice whatever they like or need from the eight lower yānas.

Astus said:

Why would they do that if it's complete as it is?

Malcolm wrote:

Because people have relative circumstances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, like Dzogchen is one body that can eat other bodies.

Sherab Dorje said:

Dzogchen is a cannibal?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is a garuda that feasts on the naḡas of the incorrect views of the eight lower vehicles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

maybe having a rational mind that can think logically is what they mean by having a penis?

Astus said:

The female body has several drawbacks in Buddhism. First of all, there are the "five obstacles, three subordinations" (

五障三從), that is, no woman can become brahma, indra, mara, cakravartin, or buddha; and they are subject to their father as a child, their husband as an adult, and their son as an old person. Furthermore, particularly in East Asian Buddhism, they are impure from menstruation (see: <http://www.onmarkproductions.com/menstruation-sutra-michael-kelsey.pdf> and

<http://www.reed.edu/hellscrolls/scrolls/Aseries/A06/A06e.html>), and suffer from giving birth (see: <http://www.buddhanet.net/e-learning/filial-sutra.htm>). It is also a regular theme that women are overly passionate.

Here is a famous section from the Nirvana Sutra (tr Yamamoto, ch 16):

"All good men and women desire to be born as a man. Why so? Because females are the nests of evil. Also, it is as in the case of the water of mosquitoes and sawflies, which cannot moisten this great earth. In addition, the sensual appetite of females cannot ever be satisfied."

But eventually the scripture states:

"Any person who does not realise that he has the Buddha-Nature is a woman. If he does so realise, he is a man. If any woman knows that she has the Buddha-Nature, she is a man."

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, what a wonderfully enshrined ode to utterly sexist bias.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Creation and completion are not part of Dzogchen praxis. They belong to mahā and anuyoga.

Sherab Dorje said:

And yet Dzogchepna's practice them.

What you are saying is like: fingers and nipples are not part of the body, only the spleen is.

Malcolm wrote:

No, like Dzogchen is one body that can eat other bodies. Dzogchen is 100 percent independent of the eight lower yānas. Each yāna is a separate, self-contained path to buddhahood.

Nevertheless, a Dzogchen practitioner can practice whatever they like or need from the eight lower yānas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is. Creation and completion stage work with mind. Dzogchen practice does not.

Sherab Dorje said:

Not even the creation and completion stage work which is part of the Dzogchen praxis?

Malcolm wrote:

Creation and completion are not part of Dzogchen praxis. They belong to mahā and anuyoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

If I was a homosexual I might just be offended by this.

Malcolm wrote:

Why?

maybay said:

Because its an ironic association of something courageous, like declaring your sexuality, with something ugly, like misogyny.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, you were just passing gas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Anders said:

And so it came to pass, on page 9, that a topic for criticising patriarchy turned into a coming-out party for misogyny.

maybay said:

If I was a homosexual I might just be offended by this.

Malcolm wrote:

Why?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Boy, you really have a low opinion of women.

maybay said:

Its funny I've just had a tenant who, for the first 45 days of her stay couldn't stop telling me how happy she was to be here. Then her friend stays for a week, and after that she's cold as metal. I can't work out her change in behaviour until, with the exact number of days required to give me notice, she sends email saying she's moving. I made meals for her (she can't cook, and in fact makes a complete mess of the kitchen when she tries. Won't take advice either), made fires in the evening, gave her free piano lessons whenever she wanted, picked up her dog shize. I even offered to marry her so she could stay in the country. But she would rather go live with two friends - the one who stayed here who thinks she comes from noble ancestry, who wouldn't give my keys back for weeks after she left, and who hasn't a shred of integrity behind what she says (she told me no less than three times in writing she would pay deposit for moving in and just didn't-no communication). What of her other friend? She successfully lied to her parents for three years that she had terminal cancer. Nuff said.

In light of some of the other stuff I've experienced I don't think insatiable is unfair at all.

Anders said:

And so it came to pass, on page 9, that a topic for criticising patriarchy turned into a coming-out party for misogyny.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybay never fails to deliver.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 8:06 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

OK. I see these aspirational Buddha fields not the same as akanistha. Fine. But then we talking about unenlightened aspirations not reality (Mahayana!) What do women feel like when they hear Sukhavati only for men but they can go to abhirati with children and keep their form? My guess is they'd still want to go to Sukhavati. Are women ever satisfied?

Malcolm wrote:

Boy, you really have a low opinion of women.

maybay said:

Its funny I've just had a tenant who, for the first 45 days of her stay couldn't stop telling me how happy she was to be here. Then her friend stays for a week, and after that she's cold as metal. I can't work out her change in behaviour until, with the exact number of

days required to give me notice, she sends email saying she's moving. I made meals for her (she can't cook, and in fact makes a complete mess of the kitchen when she tries. Won't take advice either), made fires in the evening, gave her free piano lessons whenever she wanted, picked up her dog shize. I even offered to marry her so she could stay in the country. But she would rather go live with two friends - the one who stayed here who thinks she comes from noble ancestry, who wouldn't give my keys back for weeks after she left, and who hasn't a shred of integrity behind what she says (she told me no less than three times in writing she would pay deposit for moving in and just didn't-no communication). What of her other friend? She successfully lied to her parents for three years that she had terminal cancer. Nuff said.

.

Malcolm wrote:

And you think this stands as an indictment of all women? Boy, are you bitter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 8:03 PM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

George Orwell went to Spain as a volunteer for a Trotskyist group (POUM) and fought and killed Fascists. Refer to "Homage to Catalonia".

Rosa Luxemburg was murdered and her body was unceremoniously dumped in a river, by the same type of people that then went on to support the Nazis.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think they would waver from their convictions about free speech. Orwell in particular, since he wrote this after his stint in Spain.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 7:44 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

I gotta admit its threads like this make me nostalgic for the sanity of the nikayas. But I persevere.

Malcolm wrote:

It's against bodhisattva vows to encourage you to return to the Hinayāna, but it is tempting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 7:42 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

OK. I see these aspirational Buddha fields not the same as akanistha. Fine. But then we talking about unenlightened aspirations not reality (Mahayana!) What do women feel like when they hear Sukhavati only for men but they can go to abhirati with children and keep their form? My guess is they'd still want to go to Sukhavati. Are women ever satisfied?

Malcolm wrote:

Boy, you really have a low opinion of women.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 6:24 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It says they will have penises.

maybay said:

Beings in Buddhafields don't even rebirth again, never mind procreate, never mind have sex, since there are no females in Buddhafields.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends on the buddhafield. For example, in this buddhafield and Akoṣobhya's there are men, women, children.

Get off your butt, stop being obtuse, and do some independent reading.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 6:05 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

Sorry I can't accept that penises are a feature of a Buddhafield. Here's another version:

to abandon their female form, will, upon hearing my name, all be reborn as men. They will be endowed with noble features and eventually realize Unsurpassed Supreme Enlightenment.

Which sounds more like a sutra spoken by the Buddha, and which a version tailor made

for patriarchal [insert adjective] Tibetans.

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, I don't care how some other translator glossed the text. I know what it says and what it means. It says they will have penises. It is a very common phrase in Tibetan and its meaning is just not ambiguous at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 5:35 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Any woman who has been afflicted by the one hundred faults of womanhood, despises the state of womanhood, and wishes to be completely free from the birth place of women, they will avoid the state of womanhood and will produce male genitalia until they reach final awakening.

maybay said:

Male means not female.

Malcolm wrote:

The phrase is very clear in Tibetan, skyes bu'i dbang po, a man's penis. But you said, inaccurately:

There is no distinction of sex in the buddhafiels.

So you are wrong, just admit it and move on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 5:18 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

So the monkey story was just bait for a point you were trying to make.

Malcolm wrote:

It was an example, a mirror in which a reflection could be shown.

maybay said:

That was no mirror. It has your opinion all over it.

Malcolm wrote:

We've been having these discussions for some time now. I don't think you're going to get anywhere with concepts alone.

Without the discussion, there will be no movement in a positive direction.

maybay said:

Anyone who starts a conversation with you looking for movement is in for disappointment. Take it as a compliment. It's just not your forte.

Malcolm wrote:

You really do have a problem with ad hominem remarks, you might want to get help with that. It's pretty sad.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 5:15 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For example, when it says that there are no women in the buddhafiield of Amitabha or Bhaisajyaguru, how do you think women feel about this?

maybay said:

There is no distinction of sex in the buddhafiields.

Malcolm wrote:

You are quite simple wrong. For example, this buddhafiield, the buddhafiield of Śākyamuni Buddha, has women, as does Akṣobhya's. With regard to Bhaisajyaguru's ninth aspirations for the formation of his buddhafiield:

Any woman who has been afflicted by the one hundred faults of womanhood, despises the state of womanhood, and wishes to be completely free from the birth place of women, they will avoid the state of womanhood and will produce male genitalia until they reach final awakening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

Now we have nuns scolding lay people for addressing them incorrectly.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as well they should.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Queequeg said:

But, you seem to touch on another point... are you suggesting that the way to combat these groups is to ... regulate speech, regulate assembly, etc. etc.?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, he thinks that everyone but right wing nut jobs should have free speech and right to assembly, unless he disagrees with what they too say, in which case they don't, since it is all down to what some imaginary committee in his head is going to define as acceptable speech for everyone. Orwell had it right when he said:

But freedom, as Rosa Luxembourg [sic] said, is 'freedom for the other fellow'. The same principle is contained in the famous words of Voltaire: 'I detest what you say; I will defend to the death your right to say it.' If the intellectual liberty which without a doubt has been one of the distinguishing marks of western civilisation means anything at all, it means that everyone shall have the right to say and to print what he believes to be the truth, provided only that it does not harm the rest of the community in some quite unmistakable way

And:

These people don't see that if you encourage totalitarian methods, the time may come when they will be used against you instead of for you. Make a habit of imprisoning Fascists without trial, and perhaps the process won't stop at Fascists.

<http://www.theorwellprize.co.uk/the-orwell-prize/orwell/essays-and-other-works/the-freedom-of-the-press/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

In which case free speech is based on the premise of an objective law system. It just gets worse by the minute...

Malcolm wrote:

And what, you would prefer it to be determined by some "objective" committee?

At least the legal system in the US (which actually does work for most people) is an adversarial process and depends on the plaintiff's burden of proof.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

So the monkey story was just bait for a point you were trying to make.

Malcolm wrote:

It was an example, a mirror in which a reflection could be shown.

maybay said:

We've been having these discussions for some time now. I don't think you're going to get anywhere with concepts alone.

Malcolm wrote:

Without the discussion, there will be no movement in a positive direction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 4:39 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What is the criteria?

Sherab Dorje said:

I do believe that banning incitement to baseless discrimination and mass murder is a good start.

Yup, that would be high on my list of criteria.

Malcolm wrote:

There are of course laws banning incitement, since incitement to criminal actions is not protected speech. But in order to ban such speech, incitement has to be proven. In other words, someone can say, "We ought to go out and shoot some Mexicans," and this is protected speech as long as no one responds to it or takes it seriously, as several cases where idle threats made against the life of POTUS has shown.

But if someone responds to it, and it can be a) shown that the author of such speech actually intended harm, and b) some other parties went out and engaged in that harm, then it becomes incitement.

But what you are recommending is effectively thought policing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 4:34 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

As my man DJKR says: One cannot disassociate emptiness from vividness.

This inseparability I was told is the Guru.

Recognizing this should help me

Not to be stuck with depending on chauvinist lamas.

Malcolm wrote:
And chauvinist disciples.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 3:59 AM
Title: Re: Some towns in France ban burkinis
Content:
Fa Dao said:

heres the thing...I actually disagree with the "burkini ban", I think its ridiculous. Its like putting a bandaid on a bullet wound. And its not about whatever religion I agree with. The point was is that those nuns made a choice..the majority of women in the middle east do not have that same choice. I dont disagree that some do in fact choose to wear that as religious expression...cool..personal choice...great. BUT, that being said, it should be a CHOICE not a law that is forced upon them...period.

Malcolm wrote:
But there is no law in France forcing women to wear burkinis, only an ordinance preventing them from doing so if they wish so...?

And the fact that Catholic nuns are not similarly prohibited from wearing their habits at the beach, violating French secularism ordinances, means that the ordinance against burkinis is merely French anti-Muslim bias.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 3:57 AM
Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All
Content:

Queequeg said:
Really. I'm curious... can you share more details or direct me to sources?

Malcolm wrote:
These two guys I knew years ago (circa 1985) tied up a friend of theirs for fun (they were all shitfaced) and started hassling him for being Jewish.

They were primarily sentenced for violating the Jewish guy's civil rights by calling him a "Jew."

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 3:39 AM
Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All
Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Saying "Stanley, you damn Jew" on the other hand is a civil rights violation, this will cause you to wind up in jail, since you are addressing Stanley directly.

Queequeg said:

How do you figure? Even if a state actor did that, I don't think they face jail time. There might be a Section 1983 claim.

Malcolm wrote:

Because I know someone who did serious time for such an offense (that fact that they tied him up didn't help).

Queequeg said:

An American football player named Colin Kaepernick has caused a firestorm because he refused to stand during the pre game singing of the national anthem.

Malcolm wrote:

Once I understood in third grade (1970) that I did not have to recite the pledge of allegiance, I stopped. Eventually, I stopped standing as well.

And the Star Spangled Banner is a song that glorifies slavery. I hate it.

And where is that band who so vauntingly swore
That the havoc of war and the battle's confusion,
A home and a country, should leave us no more?
Their blood has washed out their foul footsteps' pollution.
No refuge could save the hireling and slave
From the terror of flight, or the gloom of the grave:
And the star-spangled banner in triumph doth wave,
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: Negative Karma

Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:

The challenge has been encountering stories such as those I listed, or a certain infamous anecdote of a Tibetan teacher saying Holocaust victims were reaping their karma.

Malcolm wrote:

All suffering that everyone experiences is a result of karma, including the people killed in the Holocaust, the Native Americans murdered by Europeans by the millions, the African prisoners of war sold into European slavery, my Scottish ancestors who were ethnically cleansed from the Highlands to make room for sheep, you name it. All suffering is a result of karma. There is no suffering that is not a result of karma.

Monlam Tharchin said:

In what way does attributing these incidents to the victims' past negative karma benefit your practice?

I guess that's where I'm getting tripped up.

Malcolm wrote:

It helps one develop renunciation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Not in the slightest.

Malcolm wrote:

Most definitely.

Sherab Dorje said:

I explained why it doesn't, you want to explain why it does? If not, do you want to take my argument apart with logic, or are you happy with just being petulant and obstinate?

Malcolm wrote:

I am definitely not petulant, but I am happy to be obstinate.

The long and short of it however is this. When someone decides to control freedom of speech, this creates the issues of authority, "who can control speech?"

What is the criteria? Why do we decide to ban Mein Kampf, but to allow the publication of Mao's little Red Book? Or Naked Lunch? Lolita? etc.

"Hate" is too broad a criteria, just like obscenity.

One has to demonstrate that a specific act of speech has harmed someone; for example, in the US one can refer to someone as a Jew as in "Stanley is a Jew, I saw him at Temple the other day." This is not harmful speech, and no one would blink at it.

Saying to someone on an internet forum, "That Stanley is goddamn Jew," is unpleasant, but it is protected speech, at least in the US. Stanley would have to go out of his way to prove harm.

Saying "Stanley, you damn Jew" on the other hand is a civil rights violation, this will cause you to wind up in jail, since you are addressing Stanley directly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: What if...

Content:

Footsteps said:

Do we really need the seal of mastery to discuss ethical and spiritual issues?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. Anyway, who seals mastery? The question of who can legitimize authority is bankrupt. You are your own authority.

Sherab Dorje said:

How post-modern of you!

Malcolm wrote:

Well, just parroting Gendun Chopel, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Astus said:

Those who like to hear liberal things will receive it. Those who are inclined towards hierarchy will receive that.

Malcolm wrote:

We call these things "provisional teachings."

But the situation of patriarchal oppression is pervasive in this world among human beings. It is not skillful to teach patriarchal oppression in the name of "skillful means."

For example, when it says that there are no women in the buddhafiield of Amitabha or Bhaisajyaguru, how do you think women feel about this? How would you feel if you were devalued based solely on your genitalia?

conebeckham said:

Very good points.

What, by the way, should "Nuns" be called, if not "Ani-la?" I have seen the words "Ani Tsomo" but I don't know what that means as a title.....does Tibetan have a gender neutral title for the ordained? I am not sure if Getsul and Genyen are gender neutral....

Malcolm wrote:

I don't remember now what she advised us to say, but since she is in fact a gelongma, then Gelongma would be the right title.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This merely gives into the forces of oppression of which you complain.

Sherab Dorje said:

Not in the slightest.

Malcolm wrote:

Most definitely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: Negative Karma

Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:

The challenge has been encountering stories such as those I listed, or a certain infamous anecdote of a Tibetan teacher saying Holocaust victims were reaping their karma.

Malcolm wrote:

All suffering that everyone experiences is a result of karma, including the people killed in the Holocaust, the Native Americans murdered by Europeans by the millions, the African prisoners of war sold into European slavery, my Scottish ancestors who were ethnically cleansed from the Highlands to make room for sheep, you name it. All suffering is a result of karma. There is no suffering that is not a result of karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This merely gives into the forces of oppression of which you complain.

Sherab Dorje said:

Americans have not had to struggle with the tangible outcomes of Fascist, Stalinist and Nazi (style) dictatorships since the early 1900's. In western Europe the last long-running regime of this type fell only recently (Portugal 1932-1974). In Greece we had a short lived Fascist military junta from 1968-1974.

The proponents of these political regimes utilised democracy and its tools (freedom of speech) in order to abolish democracy. They are doing the same thing now in many countries, especially in the former Eastern Bloc countries (cf Ukraine). And let's not forget the war in former Yugoslavia that reignited pro-Soviet era Nationalistic tendencies and lead to all sorts of horrific slaughters.

Now while you may believe that the American approach is a more "adult" approach, the reality is that a large proportion of the citizens within democracies are not political adults. This is why one sees, for example, the likelihood of Trump being voted into power. Or the Bush dynasty.

Free speech also assumes that everybody is being heard at an equal volume. This is also naive to the point of brain death.

If the playing field were level, then there could be freedom of speech. But as things stand, the notion of freedom of speech, especially somewhere like the US, is a farce and a scam.

Given all this, the least that a politically mature citizen can ask for is that hate speech is not allowed. Unfortunately the Chinese proverb: Kill the rooster to quiet the monkeys is very practical. Particularly when applied to the types of primates that run to the support of hate mongers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Questions about Tulkus and Unrecognized Tulkus

Content:

Lukeinaz said:

Wonderful post.

Thank you Malcom.

Malcolm wrote:

Glad you enjoyed it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But the situation of patriarchal oppression is pervasive in this world among human beings. It is not skillful to teach patriarchal oppression in the name of "skillful means."

Astus said:

Patriarchal oppression does not happen to people, it is what people believe in.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it happens to people. It happens to people all the time

Astus said:

It actually takes a very aware teacher to recognise the power invested in him and to handle it appropriately.

Malcolm wrote:

Hence the problem of people being unconscious of patriarchal power relations in which they are embedded.

Astus said:

For example, when it says that there are no women in the buddhafiield of Amitabha or Bhaisajyaguru, how do you think women feel about this? How would you feel if you were devalued based solely on your genitalia?

You might know women who say they accept the traditional values of patriarchy.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't actually.

Astus said:

Now consider women in the actual traditional culture. Most of them can only think that that's how the world works and there is nothing to be done about it.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree with this, and neither do they.

Astus said:

Women's lower status is just another form of karmic consequence, although not in the Nikayas but in the Mahayana scriptures.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and this points to a deficiency in some Mahāyāna teachings which should be openly explored and not defended as Buddhavacana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Some towns in France ban burkinis

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Who defines "provocatively"? You? Other men? Women should feel free to wear whatever the hell they want, wherever they hell they want, and not be subjected to immature male complaints about it.

Sherab Dorje said:

(Hetero) Men define provocative. They then design provocative (to hetero men) clothing and sell it to women to wear. Some women wear it for professional purposes (sex workers). Some women wear it to attract men for their personal/emotional benefit. Some women wear it because it is marketed as fashionable. Some women refuse to wear it. All those that wear it objectify themselves (purposefully, or not). Sometimes they wear it for their supposed benefit, but always for the sensory benefit of (hetero) men (whether the women like it or not).

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, my question was rhetorical.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Negative Karma

Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:

What is the purpose of such stories?

Malcolm wrote:

They are didactic just so stories to encourage people to be careful in their actions. Many are so ludicrous they need to be understood for what they are, just stories.

Monlam Tharchin said:

Karma in the day to day inspires me to cultivate practice and help others.

Karma on this broader scale provokes that reaction I've shared earlier here, that karma (i.e. a fundamental part of dharma) is a cruel understanding of the world which leads to stasis, the status quo, and not a call to compassionate action.

Malcolm wrote:

Karma in the broader sense is inexorable, like water wearing down rocks. Please go outside and look a spider in its web. Some action, who knows what, led to that sentient being to take that birth. On the one hand it seems a horrible birth, on the other hand, we need spiders, and they are indispensable creatures in our ecosystems, like all creatures.

All sentient beings are buddhas, save for their temporary obscuration. What is important is to see that point and help sentient beings realize their innate potential with various methods. The rest is fodder for perseveration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Some towns in France ban burkinis

Content:

daelm said:

<http://globalnews.ca/news/2903036/people-share-photos-of-nuns-on-the-beach-in-response-to-burkini-ban-in-france/>

Fa Dao said:

Really? seriously? you are equating nuns who are basically monastics and have made the choice to go through years of training and prayer before they can take their vows and wear a habit to women in the middle east who are forced to be covered up under pain of imprisonment or even death from the time they enter puberty?

Malcolm wrote:

There is some justice in burqas after all:

The Islamic State group has reportedly issued an order banning burqas at security checkpoints in the city of Mosul.

Recently killings of Islamic State commanders by veiled women have forced the terror group to make an exception to its strict dress codes for women.

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/sep/6/isis-issues-burqa-ban-at-mosul-security-centers-af/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Negative Karma

Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:

Nor can we sidestep the implications of karma by pretending it doesn't have a moral dimension.

That is, intentions defined as unwholesome (i.e. a moral dimension) lead to mental and bodily repercussions.

Moral is not a dirty word limited to certain other religions.

What I'm struggling with is understanding the repercussions of certain aspects of the teaching of karma, not some self-existent karma entity inflicting punishment on the world, which does not exist.

Malcolm wrote:

Karma is moral causality. Engage in positive deeds, expect a positive result in this life and the next. The opposite also applies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Astus said:

Those who like to hear liberal things will receive it. Those who are inclined towards hierarchy will receive that.

Malcolm wrote:

We call these things "provisional teachings."

But the situation of patriarchal oppression is pervasive in this world among human beings. It is not skillful to teach patriarchal oppression in the name of "skillful means."

For example, when it says that there are no women in the buddhafiield of Amitabha or Bhaisajyaguru, how do you think women feel about this? How would you feel if you were devalued based solely on your genitalia?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 9th, 2016 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Questions about Tulkus and Unrecognized Tulkus

Content:

Footsteps said:

That's why I posted the subject in the Tibetan Buddhism forum.

I'm beginning to see that the answers to these particular questions do not fall under the domain of the participants of this web forum...

I hope I am mistaken, but by the present indications, it is not likely.

Malcolm wrote:

We are all tulkus.

Footsteps said:

The purpose of this post is to settle a controversy [and perhaps create another] and remove a misunderstanding about so called "sprul skus" or reincarnations, that venerable institution that causes so much controversy in Tibetan Buddhism.

In the teaching of the great perfection there are two kinds of so called nirmanakāyas or tulkus. First, there are impure forward-progression [ma dag pa lugs 'byung] nirmanakāyas i.e. all sentient beings. These arise because of ignorance.

The second are pure reverse-progression [dag pa lugs ldog] nirmanakāyas: among these there are also two, those that come from the dharmakāya and sambhogakāya, nirmanākāyas of compassion if you will. The second are called nirmanakāyas of the attained result, these are sentient beings of pure karma, blessed by being seen by the buddhas, who make more and more progress, attaining higher and higher states of yogic understanding.

Thus we sentient beings are all nirmanakāyas -- differentiated only by our level of relative attainment and relative level of pure and impure karma.

The so-called "tulkus" of institutional Tibetan Buddhism are also sentient beings; some with higher yogic attainments, some with none, and others with some. Because they are sentient beings, some remember their rebirths well, and others not at all. Some achieve high levels of yogic understanding, some are great teachers, some are panditas, poets and artists. Some tulkus are mere politicians, some are gangsters, some are thieves. But they are all sentient beings. Not one of them was not born from the womb of a human mother.

Most tulkus are never "recognized" because anyone who practices Dharma sincerely is a tulku, no matter what level of "realization" they are reputed to have, whether or not they have been recognized. In this sense, a tulku is defined as someone who acts to help sentient beings inspired by the compassion of the buddhas for sentient beings.

We are all rinpoches, precious ones. Sentient beings are precious because their plight is the cause of the compassion of the buddhas. Buddhas are precious because they exist solely to aid sentient beings from suffering. I guess you could say it is rinpoches all the way down.

Some people crave recognition, wanting others to acknowledge their status -- consider yourselves acknowledged but don't expect a title. If you want people to consider you a tulku, act like one. If you must, fake it. Faking it may even lead to developing some real compassion which exceeds your petty narrow-minded grasping to titles and position. Being a pure reverse-progression tulku means cherishing all sentient beings. Nothing is holding you back but your own selfishness.

The Dzogchen teachings acknowledge that all sentient beings are tulkus. But whether that is meaningful is not up to the buddhas, it is up to each one of us and our dedication to the path of awakening and benefitting our fellow tulkus.

In reality, tulkuhood is defined not by robes, titles, race, position, gender, education, or creed but by how we are able to apply wisdom and compassion in our efforts to aid sentient beings and alleviate their suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.atikosha.org/2011/01/we-are-all-rinpoches-nirmanakayas-and.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

conebeckham said:

I'd like to revisit an idea Malcolm raised early on this thread, and ask for some development and clarification....

In what way(s) do Terma reflect a less patriarchal system than, ostensibly,, Kama or Sarma Tantra?

Malcolm wrote:

They don't necessarily.

But the idea is that termas are produced with respect to the time of their revelation, as is their stated purpose.

conebeckham said:

Okay. In other words, methods of praxis, including tantras, sadhanas, and instructions, will reflect the environment of their gestation, or revalation, or whatnot. It seems to me that, with the exception of the very highest methods of practice, the majority of practice paths will have no choice but to represent the inequality present in that environment. I suppose the question is whether Vajrayana MUST reflect the power structures and dynamics of the environment, with respect to gender, and perhaps other factors-- whether such characteristics are essential to Vajrayana, in other words, or whether those dynamics and power structures can be corrected, equalized to a greater or lesser degree, etc., by practitioners or other sentient beings, thereby allowing practice paths and methods that reflect this less hierarchical, more "flat" (equal) environment.

Malcolm wrote:

The question is really, are Tibetan Buddhist practitioners in the West, who are otherwise in general pro-feminist, liberal, etc., unconsciously preserving antiquated patriarchal power relations in their attempts to be "good" disciples.

Once place where we see this struggle most acutely is in the desire of women to eliminate the patriarchal features imposed on female ordinands by Vinaya and Tibetan cultural morays. Karma Lekshey Tsomo once scolded my partner and I for addressing her as "ani-la," explaining that calling her "aunty" was in fact demeaning and rude.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: What if...

Content:

Footsteps said:

Do we really need the seal of mastery to discuss ethical and spiritual issues?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. Anyway, who seals mastery? The question of who can legitimize authority is bankrupt. You are your own authority.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

conebeckham said:

I'd like to revisit an idea Malcolm raised early on this thread, and ask for some development and clarification....

In what way(s) do Terma reflect a less patriarchal system than, ostensibly,, Kama or Sarma Tantra?

Malcolm wrote:

They don't necessarily.

But the idea is that termas are produced with respect to the time of their revelation, as is their stated purpose.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

daelm said:

frankly, i also understood it that way though i inclined towards Zorro or The Magnificent Seven. i hadn't thought of you that way before and made me think of past posts of yours in a different light .

Malcolm wrote:

Maybay is total throwback. He reads too many sword and sorcery and fantasy novels. It's all honor, damsels needing to be rescued, and jousting for him.

daelm said:

doesn't take away, though, i found it quite sweet and wondered if, in the past, when i found some of his posts objectionable, he hadn't been riding to someone's rescue. i can align with that impulse, even if i sometimes disagree with what he thinks rescuing consists of.

anyway.

Malcolm wrote:

He's always trying to save someone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 10:40 PM

Title: Re: Negative Karma

Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:

.The teaching on karma isn't about trying to figure that out. The teaching on karma is about us doing good action and us abstaining from bad action, as this is what helps facilitate enlightenment. To put your attention elsewhere is to miss the point.

Malcolm wrote:

Either karma is an explanation of the world or it isn't.[/qupte]

What you need to know is this much: afflictions cause actions which result in suffering. Remove the affliction, the action won't be committed and the suffering is thereby forestalled.

Karma does explain the world, as Vasubandhu stated, "the variety of the world proceeds from actions."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

daelm said:

I bet you think knights on horses. That's just too much TV for you.

frankly, i also understood it that way though i inclined towards Zorro or The Magnificent Seven. i hadn't thought of you that way before and made me think of past posts of yours in a different light .

Malcolm wrote:

Maybay is total throwback. He reads too many sword and sorcery and fantasy novels. It's all honor, damsels needing to be rescued, and jousting for him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Some towns in France ban burkinis

Content:

dreambow said:

"This has a ring of truth and so does the fact that some women in the west dress provocatively and then cry foul if they approached.

Malcolm wrote:

Who defines "provocatively"? You? Other men? Women should feel free to wear whatever the hell they want, wherever they hell they want, and not be subjected to immature male complaints about it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Questions about Tulkus and Unrecognized Tulkus

Content:

Footsteps said:

It's too bad that a buddhist forum can't shed more light on the subject, after all "tulku-hood" is a buddhist subject.

Malcolm wrote:

It is more of a Tibetan cultural subject. Tibet is the only Buddhist culture with institutionalized reincarnations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 10:18 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

Trying to have a more visceral experience will not supply you with any more facts.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is not what it says about Chökyi Lödo, the point is what it says about those of us who are willing to rationalize these things away and perpetuate the social morays (the institution of the infallible guru) that produce such callousness.

Men need to have this discussion because we are the ones who are largely unaware of our own participation in the systems of patriarchy in Vajrayāna, both east and west.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

That's not true. If you docked an animal's tail today I wouldn't hold it against you the rest of your life.

Malcolm wrote:

Whose holding a grudge? I pointed it out initially as something I don't approve of. If you have ever been to Tibet, you would be pretty appalled at how callously Tibetans in general treat animals.

maybay said:

Man says cut off tail. Man cuts off tail. Man shows no remorse. You basically know nothing about it.

Malcolm wrote:

Fantastic way to rationalize something unpleasant away.

Yeah, who he repeatedly refused. Guess who was singing his praises up to the last. Sure, it is normal when someone falls in love that they sing praises to their loved one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Anders said:

So, Vajrayana, and Buddhism in general, is soiled with patriarchy all over the place. Being aware of this and learning not to play into it is in itself step forward, but then what? What is the skilful way forward that avoids these errors then?

Malcolm wrote:

Awareness itself is the first step. Empowering women is the second. Maybay complained that there were no women (AFAWK) in this conversation, but that is ok. Women already know that Vajrayāna is a patriarchal system. The people who are ignorant of this fact are men, who are privileged by the system.

People complain about Western culture all the time, and much of their complaint has a base. But the one point where Western civilization has come to surpass others is in our recognition of women's rights. Indeed, most of the animosity aimed at the "profligate" nature of Western civilization is based on the freedom women here experience, compared to that in more "traditional" societies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayāna quite clearly has been patriarchal system, which has primarily benefitted men and disadvantaged women, in terms of social and economic relations.

maybay said:

Vajrayana quite clearly has been practiced in patriarchal societies, which has primarily benefitted men and disadvantaged women... From a historical perspective we talk about Vajrayana including its societal manifestations, but in this sense it is not a system.

Malcolm wrote:

My friend, have you bothered to read the primary texts of what we call the Vajrayāna tradition?

maybay said:

If you say in the past vajrayana was patriarchal, and with term it can be non-patriarchal, then clearly being patriarchal is not an essential characteristic.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no essential characteristics, only relational ones. That is the point, actually.

maybay said:

The only essential social element of Vajrayana is the guru disciple relationship. That is and has always been open to men and women.

Malcolm wrote:

It has not been open to women in any significant way (nuns in Tibet were and still are subject to be most horrendous shaming and pariah status -- Drukpa Kunleys bio has perfect examples of this) and even then access to the teachings has been largely class based in Tibet. We are in a unique position in the West because most of us who study and practice Secret Mantra systems including Dzogchen are middle-class, educated, white people with leisure and endowment. I am quite certain that we also have our own patriarchal cultural horizon we cannot see beyond, just as in the past.

maybay said:

...defend their honour.

Malcolm wrote:

How quaint.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

I have nothing to say about the OP. The trouble started when he brought in the monkey story and made it personal.

Malcolm wrote:

I find these kinds of attitudes towards animals and their suffering to be perfect exemplars of how patriarchs are given to behave. The point is really that people are ready to excuse such actions in their transvalued guru figure, when they would never excuse such an action in a maybay or Malcolm.

What is most amazing to me, is that people do not even experience qualms over stories such as these.

That said, of course we cannot box Chökyi Lödo's life into one incident when he was an old man who just lost his country. But at least he had been assigned a devout teenage women to care for his needs (oh, wait, another patriarchal trope).

The point is really not the person, the point is the environment in which we operate. Vajrayāna has been a patriarchal system for all of its history, not just a part. Even its reliance on the trope, "ḍākinīs as reservoirs for wisdom" is a transgressive element in an otherwise male-dominated world that serves male needs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

Rather im refuting the idea of patriarchy as vajrayana. There are vajrayanists and then there is the ecosystem they inhabit.

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayāna quite clearly has been patriarchal system, which has primarily benefitted men and disadvantaged women, in terms of social and economic relations.

[/quote]

Your criticisms amount to nothing more than a smear campaign against history—against the dead.[/quote]

They're dead, so they really don't mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 9:15 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

conebeckham said:

Samsara is about lack of perfect equanimity, innit? This should not excuse Dharma practitioners or even dharma "paths," which are also, I hasten to point out, Samsaric--right? But it should not surprise us that our inherited or adopted traditions, or even our teachers, should reflect this lack.

Malcolm wrote:

The point, Cone, is that there is a sad willingness on the part of Tibetan Buddhists in particular to equivocate or apologize for behavior which were we to know someone who engaged in these many actions we have discussed, we would understand that person to have a problem.

But strangely, in the domain of religion we readily dismiss sociopathy and psychopathy as signs of transcendence, rather than observe them for what they are: symptoms of pathological personality disorders of various kinds.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 9:11 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

The great patriarch of DW has spoken, mb. What more is there to say?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh hardly.

dzogchungpa said:

You have to admit, it's kind of true.

Malcolm wrote:

Not a chance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 7:38 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

No you haven't. Where does it say he took pleasure in that? And how can you know "mere object"? This is what you advocate, mere teachings sans devotion.

Malcolm wrote:

You can keep your sycophantic devotion. I don't need it.

dzogchungpa said:

The great patriarch of DW has spoken, mb. What more is there to say?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh hardly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 7:32 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

I don't just put posts out like I'm putting out the garbage.

Malcolm wrote:

You could have fooled me, considering the general content of your posts is pretty much effluvia.

You can't even mount a defense of patriarchy in Vajrayāna, much less come up with any rational objection to my criticism. You just whine about devotion like some lost puppy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 7:31 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

People who love making a stink about patriarchy, I wonder how long you would last in a matriarchy without your favourite piñata.

Malcolm wrote:

Did I ever once advocate for matriarchy? No.

You couldn't hit the broadside of a barn if its was three feet in front of you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 6:35 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

One subjective long shot at a time please. You still haven't shown docking tails and

patriarchy.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure I did. Treating sentient beings as if they are mere objects for the pleasure of their "owners" is one of the hall marks of patriarchal relations.

maybay said:

No you haven't. Where does it say he took pleasure in that? And how can you know "mere object"? This is what you advocate, mere teachings sans devotion.

Malcolm wrote:

You can keep your sycophantic devotion. I don't need it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Rwa Lotsawa was simply a serial killer. Tilopa certainly tortured fish, .

Malcolm wrote:

BTW, I don't believe those stories. They are just tales invented to impress Tibetans who were a rather bloody minded lot.

And, the story of Naropa giving his consort to Tilopa neatly illustrates the patriarchal nature of Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 6:01 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

Docking tails is a common practice. Please explain to me how people can breed an animal that will suffer every day just trying to breathe.

pug.jpg

People are easily shocked by abruptness and violence, but the suffering of degeneration is fated?

Malcolm wrote:

This kind of dog breeding is also a result of patriarchy.

maybay said:

One subjective long shot at a time please. You still haven't shown docking tails and patriarchy.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure I did. Treating sentient beings as if they are mere objects for the pleasure of their "owners" is one of the hall marks of patriarchal relations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 5:53 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Coëmgenu said:

They took Helena Blavatsky seriously

Malcolm wrote:

Those were Mongolians, not Tibetans.

Alexandra David Neel would be a better choice for your example.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

Docking tails is a common practice. Please explain to me how people can breed an animal that will suffer every day just trying to breathe.

pug.jpg

People are easily shocked by abruptness and violence, but the suffering of degeneration is fated?

Malcolm wrote:

This kind of dog breeding is also a result of patriarchy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 5:51 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Rwa Lotsawa was simply a serial killer.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure. Definitely. But Chanchub Dorje was a greater practitioner, and that is why we say,

"Vajrakilaya defeated Vajrabhairava."

Karma Dorje said:

Tilopa certainly tortured fish, by your estimation, and it is irrelevant that he was liberating their mindstreams as he did so.

Malcolm wrote:

A story emphasizes how horrified Naropa the Kashmiri Brahmin was at discovering him. I don't place much stock in the liberating the mind streams of fish story. YMMV.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 5:32 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Since the definition of torture relies in a large part on intention-- the intention to cause pain to coerce behaviour or to provide pleasure to the torturer, and it is unclear from the story that either of these was his motivation for cutting the monkey's tail l.

Malcolm wrote:

It is absolutely clear from the story that his motivation was " to coerce behaviour."

Karma Dorje said:

Khyentse Chokyi Lodro had a pet monkey, and someone once informed him that it would be a good idea to remove its tail, as it would no longer be able to be so mischievous. So one day, Khyentse Chokyi Lodro rather abruptly said, "We should cut off the monkey's tail right now."

No, you infer that is why he cut the monkey's tail off. There is no explanation why he did it at that particular point. Not knowing his mind, I will not hazard a guess as to his intention.

Malcolm wrote:

KD, if we talking about Joe EFing Schmo, you would not hesitate to agree. But because this person has been lionized because they are a famous guru, you are just making lame excuses. Come on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 5:20 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Since the definition of torture relies in a large part on intention-- the intention to cause pain to coerce behaviour or to provide pleasure to the torturer, and it is unclear from the

story that either of these was his motivation for cutting the monkey's tail l.

Malcolm wrote:

It is absolutely clear from the story that his motivation was " to coerce behaviour."

Karma Dorje said:

Khyentse Chokyi Lodro had a pet monkey, and someone once informed him that it would be a good idea to remove its tail, as it would no longer be able to be so mischievous. So one day, Khyentse Chokyi Lodro rather abruptly said, "We should cut off the monkey's tail right now."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: Where are the bodhisattvas?

Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:

But this seems to imply that a bodhisattva's help is no more efficacious than that of an ordinary person.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, if all you are interested in is food, clothing or medicine.

But if you are interested in Dharma teachings, they are much more helpful.

Monlam Tharchin said:

Without these things, beings cannot invest time or energy into the Dharma, can they?

Malcolm wrote:

That is why bodhisattvas give food, clothing and medicine, if that is more relevant to a person's situation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 5:05 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

if I were to say that a butcher was torturing his animals, we would think something rather different than that he was just butchering them.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, a butcher kills his animals, ideally, they die immediately.

When you cut off a monkey's tail, it suffers from the initial pain of having its tail sawed off, then it suffers for days and days while it heals. And it suffers for the rest of its life because its sense of balance is ruined. That is torture.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: Where are the bodhisattvas?

Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:

But this seems to imply that a bodhisattva's help is no more efficacious than that of an ordinary person.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, if all you are interested in is food, clothing or medicine.

But if you are interested in Dharma teachings, they are much more helpful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

In some technical sense I concede your point, but frankly I think it is a very misleading thing to say.

Malcolm wrote:

If someone technically cut off your arm, I think you would call it torture. Or are you so brainwashed as to excuse animal cruelty in a guy who supposedly is enlightened.

dzogchungpa said:

I am not excusing anything but with all due respect, I think you are tripping.

Malcolm wrote:

With all lack of respect, you are making excuses for cruelty to animals.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

In any case your suggestion that JKCL cut off the monkey's tail as an act of torture, and that this is somehow associated with patriarchy, is absurd.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not make that association. But since you bring it up, since a key feature of patriarchy is reducing living creatures to the level of objects, well yes, they are related.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

It's technically a mayhem.

Malcolm wrote:

Among lawyers. Ordinary people call it torture and maiming. In either case it is an extraordinarily cruel thing to do to a monkey (or a dog, or a cat.)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 4:54 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

In some technical sense I concede your point, but frankly I think it is a very misleading thing to say.

Malcolm wrote:

If someone technically cut off your arm, I think you would call it torture. Or are you so brainwashed as to excuse animal cruelty in a guy who supposedly is enlightened.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In any case, the story can be found.

dzogchungpa said:

Here is the entire passage:

As I mentioned earlier, Khyentse Chokyi Lodro had a pet monkey, and someone once informed him that it would be a good idea to remove its tail, as it would no longer be able to be so mischievous. So one day, Khyentse Chokyi Lodro rather abruptly said, "We should cut off the monkey's tail right now." Tashi Namgyal held the monkey and I held the tail and Khyentse Chokyi Lodro cut off his tail with a kitchen knife. Afterward I thought that Khyentse Chokyi Lodro might change his expression somehow - that perhaps he would be sad or feel compassion for the monkey, but to my surprise he

remained perfectly relaxed and normal.
(DKR is the narrator)

You feel that incident can be accurately described as "Jamyang Khyentse Chokyi Lodö's torturing of a monkey", to use your words?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, absolutely. If someone cut off your arm, for example, wouldn't you described this as torture? Monkeys use their tail as a limb.

The OED says:

torture |'tôrCHər|

noun

the action or practice of inflicting severe pain on someone as a punishment or to force them to do or say something, or for the pleasure of the person inflicting the pain.

- great physical or mental suffering or anxiety: the torture I've gone through because of loving you so.

- a cause of suffering or anxiety: dances were absolute torture because I was so small.

verb [with obj.]

inflict severe pain on: most of the victims had been brutally tortured.

- cause great mental suffering or anxiety to: he was tortured by grief.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 4:43 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

What differentiates practitioners of Mahamudra or HYT from Dzogchenpa, view, practice, both?

Astus said:

That sounds to me too broad a question. Practitioners are individuals, and people can use for practice all sorts of things, and approach the same method in many ways. As for the ideal part, there is creation stage, and there are various forms of completion stage: six yogas, dzogchen, and mahamudra. All four could be combined, all four can be used separately, and in any other setting. Besides that, I guess you are already familiar with the general descriptions of those methods.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Yeah but most Dzogchenpa I know of (at least those that openly advertise as such) also do tantric creation and completion stage practices. In fact, seems like there is Dzogchen literature concerned with that. I'm just wondering if there's any real dividing line.

Malcolm wrote:

There is. Creation and completion stage work with mind. Dzogchen practice does not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 4:34 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Perhaps you mean "Brilliant Moon"? In that case, "torturing" is kind of hyperbolic, don't you think?

Just sayin'.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, blazing splendour.

maybay said:

There's no mention in Blazing Splendour. The story in Brilliant Moon was cutting off the monkey's tale.

Malcolm wrote:

In any case, the story can be found.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Perhaps you mean "Brilliant Moon"? In that case, "torturing" is kind of hyperbolic, don't you think?

Just sayin'.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, blazing splendour.

dzogchungpa said:

Really? I've read that book a few times and I think I would remember something like that. Can you give a page number or something?

Malcolm wrote:
it is in the chapter on Chokyi Lödo.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 3:54 AM
Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna
Content:
Crazywisdom said:
I like the Indian material just fine.

Malcolm wrote:
Both Saraha and Virupa derided sexual yogas. etc.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 3:51 AM
Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna
Content:
maybay said:
It is the lesser of evils, if you accept that it was a consideration.

Malcolm wrote:
"The lesser of two evils is still evil."

-- Jerry Garcia.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 3:50 AM
Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna
Content:

conebeckham said:
I don't know that story, and have a feeling I don't want to.....right?

Malcolm wrote:
Blazing Splendour.

dzogchungpa said:
Perhaps you mean "Brilliant Moon"? In that case, "torturing" is kind of hyperbolic, don't you think?

Just sayin'.

Malcolm wrote:
Nope, blazing splendour.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 1:04 AM
Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
You can find the reference in Yarnall's translation of the creation stage section of sngags rim chen mo of Tsongkhapa.

Astus said:
Alas, I don't have that one (<https://books.google.com/books?id=4cZyNwAACAAJ>).
I am quite certain that the reference refers to Śrī Simha.
So, was Sri Simha a member of the sahayajogin's group together with Saraha and Maitripa...

Malcolm wrote:
Much earlier, eight century, not tenth. (I said ninth, before, that was an error).

Astus said:
therefore dzogchen and mahamudra come from the same movement?

Malcolm wrote:
Not the same movement, similar skepticism though.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 12:59 AM
Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna
Content:
Crazywisdom said:
I don't agree these things are deprecated. These were always for a small group. And rare. These methods remain to most concrete and obvious pointers.

Malcolm wrote:
In Dzogchen? Of course they are, which is why Longchenpa derides sexual yogas as being for immature horny people to pass time until they are ready for real practice.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 12:19 AM
Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna
Content:

conebeckham said:

Yes. And teachers who may in fact be "above it all" may in fact include such reflections, on the gradual paths. This would be skillful means.

Malcolm wrote:

Nice apologetic, but I am not buying it. No more than I find Jamyang Khyentse Chokyi Lodö's torturing of a monkey acceptable.

conebeckham said:

I don't know that story, and have a feeling I don't want to.....right?

Malcolm wrote:

Blazing Splendour.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is clearly an earlier, skeptical movement that can be directly traced back to Śrī Siṃha in India, and we have evidence for this in the work of Mañjuśrīkīrti, who mentions Śrī Siṃha by name, as well as other associates of Padmasambhava such as Bhikṣuṇi Nandi.

Astus said:

I've read some works of Mathes but don't remember any mention of Dzogchen there. Do you know which one it was? Or do you mean that Dzogchen has the same origin as Mahamudra in India?

Malcolm wrote:

No, this reference is not in Matthis. You can find the reference in Yarnall's translation of the creation stage section of sngags rim chen mo of Tsongkhapa. He is not so confident about the identity of the named figures because he is not very familiar with the sNying ma tradition and its history. But I am quite certain that the reference refers to Śrī Siṃha. Moreover, there was push back by the anonymous author of the Hevajra Tantra who places this debate in the mouth of Vajragarbha:

Vajragarbha asked:

“This yoga of the completion stage,
its joy is called great bliss.
Completion is not a meditation,
so why do creation?”

The Bhgavan replied:

“Incredible, the great bodhisattva,
has lost the power of faith.
Where does bliss come from without the existence of the body?
Such bliss cannot be spoken of.
Joy pervades all migrating beings
in the form of pervaded and pervader.

Just as the fragrance present in a flower,
cannot be known without the flower's existence.
In the same way, since form and so on won't exist,
also bliss itself won't be perceived.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 8th, 2016 at 12:03 AM
Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna
Content:

conebeckham said:
I would venture to say that there are more qualified female teachers now than ever, as well. Certainly a cause for rejoicing.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes. Buddhadharma is not inherently patriarchal, but when the crystal ball of Dharma placed on the "sheet" of patriarchal culture, that culture shows through the crystal.

conebeckham said:
Yes. And teachers who may in fact be "above it all" may in fact include such reflections, on the gradual paths. This would be skillful means.

Malcolm wrote:
Nice apologetic, but I am not buying it. No more than I find Jamyang Khyentse Chokyi Lodö's torturing of a monkey acceptable.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 11:56 PM
Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna
Content:

conebeckham said:
I would venture to say that there are more qualified female teachers now than ever, as well. Certainly a cause for rejoicing.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Buddhadharma is not inherently patriarchal, but when the crystal ball of Dharma placed on the "sheet" of patriarchal culture, that culture shows through the crystal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Mahamudra as a separate system from HYT is a Tibetan invention.

Malcolm wrote:

That may well be the case, historically, but it cannot be denied that in the ninth century, in India, there was a skeptical movement with respect to creation stage ritualism, as well as sexual yogas and so on found in the so called highest yoga tantras that originated with Śrī Siṃha and his milieu, and was continued later by Saraha, etc. Indians like Vairocana and Vajrapani introduced Mahāmudra to Tibet as an independent tradition. This is well established now. Read Klaus Dieter Matthijs.

conebeckham said:

And even if it were a "Tibetan invention," so what?

I am quite certain the same aspersions have been cast on Dzogchen on the past.

It gets quite tiresome, frankly.

EDIT: I see Astus has cast the same aspersions, LOL.

Malcolm wrote:

To whom is this addressed?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

Astus said:

Dzogchen as a separate method is a Tibetan invention as well...

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is clearly an earlier, skeptical movement that can be directly traced back to Śrī Siṃha in India, and we have evidence for this in the work of Mañjuśrīkīrti, who mentions Śrī Siṃha by name, as well as other associates of Padmasambhava such as Bhikṣu Nandi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 11:46 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Mahamudra as a separate system from HYT is a Tibetan invention.

Malcolm wrote:

That may well be the case, historically, but it cannot be denied that in the ninth century, in India, there was a skeptical movement with respect to creation stage ritualism, as well as sexual yogas and so on found in the so called highest yoga tantras that originated with Śrī Siṃha and his milieu, and was continued later by Saraha, etc. Indians like Vairocanaraksita and Vajrapani introduced Mahāmudra to Tibet as an independent tradition. This is well established now. Read Klaus Dieter Matthis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

Derek said:

It provides additional evidence of the intermingling of Saivism and Buddhism at that time.

Malcolm wrote:

But this is really quite irrelevant to Dzogchen and Dzogchen tantras. Have you read any?

There is no intertextuality at all between Dzogchen tantras and non-Buddhist tantras.

Dzogchen is its own thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

maybay said:

A group of men discussing patriarchy in Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is all very patriarchal, which is my entire point.

maybay said:

Seems kind of unavoidable don't you think? I mean, men like talking about this stuff. Woman generally don't. How is terma going to change that?

Malcolm wrote:

Women are not the voiceless class they used to be. There are plenty of women here who talk about all kinds of things.

As far as terms go, we can already see a shift. Within the past 100 years, there have already been four famous women tertons (three in the past 50) , whereas in the past 1000, I can think of only one (there may be others), Jomo Menmo.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Meta-discussion, much?

Malcolm wrote:

No, this a discussion. A metadiscussion is having a discussion about a discussion. What we are discussing is patriarchy in Vajrayāna.

maybay said:

A group of men discussing patriarchy in Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is all very patriarchal, which is my entire point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

conebeckham said:

I dunno if this meta discussion--these are interesting topics, and recurring ideas, regarding Tantra as a subject--though I'm aware of whence this thread hath sprung.

Malcolm wrote:

True, I was replying in another thread, and as so frequently happens to me on DW, in the midst of my reply, the thread was closed. [Now this is a metadiscussion]. But I think this topic title is more apropos.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
Meta-discussion, much?

Malcolm wrote:
No, this a discussion. A metadiscussion is having a discussion about a discussion.
What we are discussing is patriarchy in Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 10:58 PM
Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna
Content:

conebeckham said:
Nor do I, and to be fair, I've not heard any commentary regarding those passages that attempts to make it so...but, you know, the gloss for "Guru Resides Always in the Bhaga," for instance--do you think it is only explicit meaning, and the implicit (or willfully construed) interpretations are apologetics, or somehow deflections from the literal?

Malcolm wrote:
No, there are of course various interpretive schemes for the Indian tantras, the six limits, and so on. It can be fun and interesting to read various attempts by Indian panditas to explain these things. And when it comes to the same tantra, different Panditas have wildly different explanations, meaning that there was very little consensus on just how to interpret these tantras. Of course, then there is the fact that Tibetans, in general, preferred violence to eroticism, which is why the more popular yidams among Tibetans are Vajrabhairava, Vajrakīlaya, and so on.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 10:55 PM
Title: Re: Negative Karma
Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:
Seeing Mary Turner, we sadly shake our heads, saying if only she hadn't committed great evil, this wouldn't have happened.

Malcolm wrote:
Seeing Mary Turner, we shake our heads in disbelief at human cruelty, and try to make a world where people like her and her husband can live free of terror and oppression.

Karma does not enter into it. Karma is an explanation from the point of view of Dharma language, not worldly language.

We abuse the doctrine of karma when we say things like, "That was their karma, too bad."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

The real ganapuja is realized when one eats ejaculate or shit with eyes wide open, like the Guhyasamaja says. Your lama said eat your cookie with nonduality. Good luck with that vague notion. The former is concrete exercise.

Malcolm wrote:

Ganapuja is cookies and milk. Ganacakra, well, that is something else altogether.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 10:32 PM

Title: Re: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

conebeckham said:

Okay, but don't we understand this as a reflection of larger cultural values of the time?

Malcolm wrote:

Why would that excuse it?

conebeckham said:

Which leads one to wonder if that was the skillful means of the Mahasiddhas (and Buddha, for that matter) who spoke or wrote the sutras and Tantras?

Malcolm wrote:

Are we certain that what we have in this or that text are the literal words of this or that Buddha, free from editing by human beings? I am not so certain. Are you?

This is one reason, that as a class of literature, I like Dzogchen tantras. They are, like the Dohas of Saraha and Virupa, largely free from, or explicitly critical of, all of this kind of imagery, apart from what they inherent from the Guhyagarbha in terms of the mandala of peaceful and wrathful deities. But in Dzogchen tantras, the so called "antinomian" aspects of the Guhyagarbha are so sublimated as to be nonexistent. This is another reason why Dzogchen is more appropriate today, because it has a place in a post-patriarchal society. Cakrasamvara, Hevajra, etc., will have a more difficult time.

conebeckham said:

And...a question, if I may. The levels of commentary re TantrA itself--with "twilight language," modes of explication as symbology vs. literal interpretation, etc.---do we think these were invented by apologists, or by prudish Tibetans or monastics?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think that texts describing the breasts and genitalia of young women in order to ascertain their suitability for consort practice need to be understood as intentional language.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Negative Karma

Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:

If we say Mary Turner experienced karma of retribution for past negative deeds, do we not then shift the onus onto her instead of her attackers?

Malcolm wrote:

She was not responsible for their intention.

Monlam Tharchin said:

Didn't they do her a favor by dispensing with this particular karmic debt, of which we say she is now free?

Malcolm wrote:

It is true that for this person, that ripening will never again happen.

Monlam Tharchin said:

Where does the logic leap then to "Mary Turner committed such evil in the past that being killed in this way makes perfect sense"?

Malcolm wrote:

We cannot know what deed, small or large, that led to such a ripening. All we can know is that she experienced such a ripening.

Karma does not make senseless violence sensible, nor injustice just. The operations of karma are beyond sense and justice. They are relentless.

The ripening of karma is something which we all experience. For example, it could be the case that in the past, this person destroyed a spiders nest with juvenile spiders with some intense anger and hatred. What we consider small actions can have a very large result.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

the Manjusriyamulakalpa states that Saiva, Garuda and Vaisnava mantras were all taught originally by Manjushri.

Derek said:

It's just more evidence that "Tantric Śaivism and Tantric Buddhism borrowed freely from one another, creating marked parallelisms primarily in practice, and sometimes in thought as well." <http://www.sutrajournal.com/the-tantric-age-a-comparison-of-shaiva-and-buddhist-tantra-by-christopher-wallis>

Malcolm wrote:

Interesting article, but it is irrelevant to Dzogchen and its historical formation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Believe in the translation? Believe in Sanderson's analysis?

Yes I believe the Manjusriyamulakalpa states that Saiva, Garuda and Vaisnava mantras were all taught originally by Manjushri.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is not under dispute. The question was do you believe these things were actually taught by Mañjuśrī.

BuddhaFollower said:

Considering the Manjusriyamulakalpa is a major Indian text, you must believe.

Malcolm wrote:

Ummm, no. That level of credulity I leave for fundamentalists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 9:48 PM

Title: Patriarchy in Vajrayāna

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Basically folks, Vajrayāna reflects male, patriarchal values. Just accept this is so and move on.

Does this mean that Vajrayāna cannot itself move beyond such values? Of course not (that's why we have terms).

But we do ourselves a disservice by pretending that some of the tropes in Vajrayāna which are deeply sexist do not exist, and are in fact based on the idea of women as disposable property. For example, one hears accounts of young women who died after being used during empowerments.

There is an inherent sexism in the trope of lower caste women being used by upper caste males.

While some revisionist scholars such as Miranda Shaw indulge in romantic fantasies about the origins of Vajrayāna being grounded in subaltern female gurus, we should shelve such interpretations for the fantasies that they are.

While it is true that there were female gurus in ancient India, and continuing on in Tibet, we still have Yeshe Tsogyal referring to herself over and over again as someone of lower birth (skye dman) and small intelligence (shes rab chung) merely because she is a woman.

The very fact that there is a samaya vow not to disparage women as being incapable of buddhahood is in fact proof of the depth of patriarchy and sexism which permeates the Buddhist environment in which Vajrayāna arose.

For example, there are literally hundreds of texts which describe the features of young women (generally between 15 and 25, but in Kalācakra, as young as 12) to be used for partners, the size of their breasts, buttocks and eyes, the shape of their vaginas, their smell, tone of their voice, etc, for use as consorts by men. But I have never seen a similar text for men in which they are analyzed for the size and shape of their penis, and so on, for their suitability to be used as consorts by women.

So ladies and gentleman, let us not pretend that Buddhism in general has not expressed itself historically as a patriarchal religion, and in particular, that Vajrayāna (from kriya tantra to anuyoga) does not have obvious and explicit patriarchal features.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You believe that?

BuddhaFollower said:

Believe in the translation? Believe in Sanderson's analysis?

Yes I believe the Manjusriyamulakalpa states that Saiva, Garuda and Vaisnava mantras were all taught originally by Manjushri.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is not under dispute. The question was do you believe these things were actually taught by Mañjuśrī.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 12:08 PM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Dan74 said:

I was never offended by what Nicholas posted nor wanted him censored. The trouble I had was that he did not engage in discussion.

My mistake was that I had misjudged the volume of his other contributions. For that I apologise.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a good man who can recognize their error and apologize for it.

Thanks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 10:00 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Coëmgenu said:

As a homosexual, one of the groups most frequently accused of propagating "PC safe-space nonsense"...

Malcolm wrote:

Nah, that is mostly immature college kids who think they have a right not to be offended.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 9:56 AM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

Derek said:

5. Consciousness. In both traditions, the central focus is on consciousness, and in particular on pure consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the focus in Dzogchen is not on consciousness per se (the all-basis, the ālaya), it is on understanding the basis, which is inseparable emptiness and clarity.

Moreover, Trika is grounded in the modified Saṃkhya of the Shaiva tradition; whereas Dzogchen has its feet firmly planted in Abhidharma and Madhyamaka.

BuddhaFollower said:

Even though Saiva tradition has a Samkhya background, the Manjusriyamulakalpa states that Saiva, Garuda and Vaishnava mantras were all taught originally by Manjushri.

Malcolm wrote:

You believe that?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[Yes, you did agree, and then we got lost in this hate speech discussion.

Sherab Dorje said:

I'll agree with you (again) on this point. But the issue is actually one about free speech, is it not? Or do you want to discuss Nicholas's "goodbye cruel forum" drama? Just in case you didn't notice: Nicholas DECIDED that instead of facing the consequences for posting discriminatory garbage, he would rather leave the forum.

Malcolm wrote:

I think that Dan's comment was unfortunate, and I think that liberal intolerance is just as damaging as "hate speech."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Admin_PC said:

On this we agree. I find a lot of value in Nick's posts on Buddhist doctrines, sutras, and history.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that was my initial point, which was derailed by SD.

Sherab Dorje said:

BS! Go back and actually read what I said, you will find that I agreed with you.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you did agree, and then we got lost in this hate speech discussion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I find it more unfortunate however that Dan chose to misrepresent Nick's over all contribution to the forum, which is what started this whole dialogue.

Admin_PC said:

On this we agree. I find a lot of value in Nick's posts on Buddhist doctrines, sutras, and history.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that was my initial point, which was derailed by SD.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Admin_PC said:

In Nicholas' case, he was just posting links to discriminatory articles as authoritative statements, with absolutely no commentary. Furthermore, he became indignant when it was removed, claiming it was an authoritative statement. Criticizing discriminatory behavior is not the same as posting discriminatory behavior as authoritative.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, we can't know that, can we, since you removed the article, the link and the entire thread. And by doing so, you prevented people from protesting its discriminatory content, or rebuffing Nick in a proper way. Such are the consequences of censorship.

Admin_PC said:

Correction: "* you can't know that". People did protest its discriminatory content, both in the thread and by filing multiple reports. Sorry you missed it. Such are the consequences of not being able to read every thread on this forum as they happen.

Malcolm wrote:

I am familiar with the situation. I think it is unfortunate that you chose to delete the thread. I find it more unfortunate however that Dan chose to misrepresent Nick's over all contribution to the forum, which is what started this whole dialogue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Admin_PC said:

In Nicholas' case, he was just posting links to discriminatory articles as authoritative statements, with absolutely no commentary. Furthermore, he became indignant when it was removed, claiming it was an authoritative statement. Criticizing discriminatory behavior is not the same as posting discriminatory behavior as authoritative.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, we can't know that, can we, since you removed the article, the link and the entire thread. And by doing so, you prevented people from protesting its discriminatory content, or rebuffing Nick in a proper way. Such are the consequences of censorship.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Admin_PC said:

No Discriminating Against Members on the Basis of their Gender, Sexual Preferences, Ethnic Group, Language, etc - pretty straightforward.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, that was not happening here.

Admin_PC said:

Discriminating against Transgenders is still discriminating against someone on the basis of Gender.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, that did not happen. Posting a link to an article than someone find discomforting does not amount to discrimination.

Then why, pray tell, do you allow such posts as this:

"Homosexual behavior, especially, is behavior that will put an end to nations and humanity. What does it mean by putting an end to nations? Someone who practices homosexuality will not care about their country, so that country will disintegrate. Homosexuals do not procreate, so the human race will vanish! This kind of behavior is forbidden by national law, universal law, and natural law. Those who do will fall into the hells no matter who they are. Every one of us must know this.

People cannot be oblivious to the basic responsibilities of human beings, otherwise we cannot even compare to animals. Notice how animals do not engage in homosexual

behavior. Some may argue that same-sex lab rats practice homosexuality, but that is because you force these rats. Has anyone confined you so that you are only with those of your sex and make you practice homosexuality? This kind of behavior defies creation; it is wrong. Cultivators must be normal and not psychologically deranged."

the rest can be read here:

<http://www.gbm-online.com/online/dharma/avoid.html>

Or perhaps this is allowed to stand because it was posted before the present Safe Space regime?

Perhaps you ought to figure out what your actual policies are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

The the Guhyasiddhi of Padmavajra, a work associated with the Guhyasamaja tradition, prescribes acting as a Saiva guru and initiating members into Saiva Siddhanta scriptures and mandalas.

Malcolm wrote:

The work begins however by saying:

Though indeed there are other tantras,
any taught by the guide, the Buddha,
possess definitive intimate instructions.
I shall now explain them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

By this stringent definition, anything can be defined as hate speech if it is speech you don't like.

Admin_PC said:

No Discriminating Against Members on the Basis of their Gender, Sexual Preferences, Ethnic Group, Language, etc - pretty straightforward.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, that was not happening here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, September 7th, 2016 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahaha, nice try. Who defines "hate speech?" Are we so fragile that we need censors deciding for us what constitutes hate speech? No thanks.

I cannot see the censored article now, so I cannot decide for myself if it constitutes "hate speech." This is the problem with censorship.

Admin_PC said:

If it does not affect you personally, then I hardly see how you're qualified to determine if it's hate speech.

Malcolm wrote:

By this stringent definition, anything can be defined as hate speech if it is speech you don't like.

Admin_PC said:

Disagreeing with someone's lifestyle choices may, in fact be a clear violation of the policies on discriminatory behavior.

Malcolm wrote:

But there are kinds of disagreements about people's lifestyle choices here, for example, "eat meat" vs. "don't eat meat"; "drink alcohol" vs. "don't drink alcohol", and so on. Given what you have said above, there is all kinds of discrimination going on here.

Admin_PC said:

It's very little to do with "pc police" and a lot to do with an agreed upon policy that's already in place.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you all are just the present regime in charge, and you decide things as you see fit, using the vaguely worded TOS to back up whatever arbitrary decisions you make. I accept that this is the case, but I will protest when I think you or another moderator speaking incorrectly, as did Dan above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2016 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Questions about Tulkus and Unrecognized Tulkus

Content:

Footsteps said:

These questions about Tulkus pertain to the realm of Unrecognized Tulkus.

Does the act of remembering past lives make one a tulku?

Does remembering the act of choosing one's birth prior to incarnation make one a tulku?

What are the definitive/indicative factors that determine whether or not an individual is an unrecognized tulku?

Malcolm wrote:

You have to get a Tibetan Lama to sign off on it, the higher, the better.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2016 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Granted, but almost nobody refers to Rinpoche with that initialism.

Finney said:

That doesn't seem to be the case, unless this happens to be a very recent change. I know several of his students, two people who help run one of his organizations, and a few lamas who went to Dzongsar Institute and they all regularly refer to him as Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche, even just Khyentse Rinpoche. I'm not sure I've ever heard them use Dzongsar Jamyang Khyentse Rinpoche and I don't believe they're being at all disrespectful.

dzogchungpa said:

I was referring to the <https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/initialism> 'DKR', not what it abbreviates, "Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche", which indeed is in common use. I was just teasing Malcolm about what I take to be his reluctance to associate DJKR with Jamyang, i.e. Manjushri.

Malcolm wrote:

That is an awfully silly projection on your part, chung. Further, just for the record, 'jam dbyangs is Mañjughośa. 'jam dpal is Mañjuśrī.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2016 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I get it now. You support censorship of opinions not in accord with your own. Good to know.

Sherab Dorje said:

No, you don't get it at all. I believe that freedom of speech does not apply to hate speech, whether the hate speech corresponds to my opinions or not.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahaha, nice try. Who defines "hate speech?" Are we so fragile that we need censors deciding for us what constitutes hate speech? No thanks.

I cannot see the censored article now, so I cannot decide for myself if it constitutes "hate speech." This is the problem with censorship.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2016 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Whereas it is tolerant to allow them to allow people to disgrace people on the basis of their gender, sexual preference, race etc...?

Malcolm wrote:

Speech is either free, or it isn't.

Sherab Dorje said:

There is no such thing as free. Everything comes at a cost.

Malcolm wrote:

I get it now. You support censorship of opinions not in accord with your own. Good to know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2016 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I think it is a pretty fair assessment of his political threads.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not tolerant to shout down or marginalize people who are politically conservative.

Sherab Dorje said:

Whereas it is tolerant to allow them to allow people to disgrace people on the basis of their gender, sexual preference, race etc...?

Malcolm wrote:

Speech is either free, or it isn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2016 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I take it that you did not see the last thread?

Malcolm wrote:

you mean this?

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=36&t=23504&p=352353#p352353>

Sherab Dorje said:

Nope. He started a thread in which he had a link to an article with a blanket condemnation of transgenderism.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Some people think that it is wrong. They have a right to their opinion. They even have a right to express that opinion here, so I presume, unless we have become so dominated by EU PC nonsense that we no longer have the right to express opinions which do not fit the preconceptions of the moderating staff.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2016 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I think it is a pretty fair assessment of his political threads.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not tolerant to shout down or marginalize people who are politically conservative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2016 at 10:50 PM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, Nick's posts on the issues of transgenderism have been largely confined the trend in some areas to encourage children with gender dysmorphia to explore reassignment surgery. I agree with him that this is wrong headed.

Sherab Dorje said:
I take it that you did not see the last thread?

Malcolm wrote:
you mean this?

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=36&t=23504&p=352353#p352353>

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2016 at 10:48 PM
Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
This is an absolutely unfair assessment of Nick's posting history.

Sherab Dorje said:
Not absolutely unfair. I think it is a pretty fair assessment of his political threads.

Of course he does also contribute quite heavily to the Mahayana sections of the board.
Without a doubt.

Malcolm wrote:
It is absolutely unfair. Dan said:

Most of what you contribute, Nicholas, has nothing to do with Mahayana and Vajrayana Buddhism, but not only that, you don't engage in discussion. So clearly this is not a good fit.
This is completely false. Therefore, it is absolutely unfair.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2016 at 10:43 PM
Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All
Content:
Dan74 said:
Most of what you contribute, Nicholas, has nothing to do with Mahayana and Vajrayana Buddhism, but not only that, you don't engage in discussion. So clearly this is not a good fit.

If you find a forum with a subtitle that says "A soapbox for reactionaries who don't want to discuss but like to complain about all sorts of modern goings-on" that might be a perfect place for you.

Malcolm wrote:

This is an absolutely unfair assessment of Nick's posting history.

Dan74 said:

Then I apologise unreservedly and withdraw.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that you condemned him without even looking to see where and what he mostly posts about (sūtra studies). While it is true that of late he has posted on the issue of Transgender politics re: minors, in fact I agree with him that allowing minors to undergo elective gender reassignment surgery is quite wrong and misguided, not to mention the fact that from a BUDDHIST point of view, specifically, Abhidharma, it is not possible to change one's biological gender, whether male, female or intersexed. You cannot become a man by removing your breasts and sewing on a penis anymore than you can become a woman by taking hormones to grow breasts and castrating yourself. There is, in the women's community, a lot of discussion amongst women-born women about how to accommodate trans-women who will never (in this life) have the gendered experience of experiencing menstruation, childbirth and menopause, for example.

Having said this, I sympathize with people who experience gender dysmorphia, and if they are adults, it is not my job to approve or disapprove of their choices about lifestyle, surgery, and so on.

Nevertheless, Nick's posts on the issues of transgenderism have been largely confined to the trend in some areas to encourage children with gender dysmorphia to explore reassignment surgery. I agree with him that this is wrong headed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2016 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Fare Thee Well All

Content:

Dan74 said:

Most of what you contribute, Nicholas, has nothing to do with Mahayana and Vajrayana Buddhism, but not only that, you don't engage in discussion. So clearly this is not a good fit.

If you find a forum with a subtitle that says "A soapbox for reactionaries who don't want to discuss but like to complain about all sorts of modern goings-on" that might be a perfect place for you.

Malcolm wrote:

This is an absolutely unfair assessment of Nick's posting history.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2016 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Buddha in God realm?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Indra.

Losal Samten said:

Are you basing that on something higher than Sutra? Mipham says in his MAV commentary that "The majority of [third bhumi bodhisattvas] are born as "Indra" and they are able to draw their subjects out of the mud of desire".

Malcolm wrote:

Shitro.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2016 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: Buddha in God realm?

Content:

Tirisilex said:

I heard that there is a Buddha in the God Realm trying to teach the Gods Buddhism. Anyone know what his name is?

Malcolm wrote:

Indra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2016 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I have nothing against DKR. Having an aversion to someone is quite different than disagreeing with their view on this or that point. He has a lot of responsibilities thrust upon him. I would not want to be him or anyone like him, ever. Being recognized a tulku is a sure fire way to make sure that subject of the recognition will never have their own life.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, you're off the hook. From now on, though, could you please write 'DJKR' instead of 'DKR'?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, when they update his name on his own website:

<http://khyentsefoundation.org/about-us/>

dzogchungpa said:

Khyentse Foundation is a nonprofit organization founded in 2001 by Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche to support all traditions of Buddhist study and practice. Since 2001, the foundation has supported individuals and institutions in more than 30 countries and has directly affected the lives of people around the world. Khyentse Foundation activities include major text preservation and translation projects, support for traditional monastic colleges in Asia, a worldwide scholarship and awards program, academic development of Buddhist studies in major universities, training and development for Buddhist leaders and teachers, Buddhist education for children, support for individual study and retreats, and more.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2016 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

While I certainly applaud his openness in allowing specialists in non-Buddhist traditions teach in depth presentations of their tenets where Buddhists can listen to them...

dzogchungpa said:

You're applauding something about DJKR?

Malcolm wrote:

I have nothing against DKR. Having an aversion to someone is quite different than disagreeing with their view on this or that point. He has a lot of responsibilities thrust upon him. I would not want to be him or anyone like him, ever. Being recognized a tulku is a sure fire way to make sure that subject of the recognition will never have their own life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2016 at 1:55 AM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, this is his opinion. I think he is completely wrong and overstating the case.

dzogchungpa said:

Understood, I just wanted people to see that I wasn't making it up.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, we know you are not making it up:

<http://www.deerpark.in/programs/archive/the-vibration-of-consciousness-the-spanda-k-rik/>

While I certainly applaud his openness in allowing specialists in non-Buddhist traditions teach in depth presentations of their tenets where Buddhists can listen to them, I think it is somewhat strange to make the unequivocal assertion that Trika (which has three different systems: kūla, spanda, and pratyabhijñā) and Vajrayāna are identical in meaning. And, I don't see any Bonpo teachers offering teachings there. Which is a bit strange because the first Khyentse was quite close to Bon. Bon and Vajrayāna are in fact identical in meaning. Bon needs more support than Trika.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, September 6th, 2016 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

FWIW I recently heard Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche, whose Deer Park Institute regularly holds courses and seminars on Kashmir Shaivism, say that it is "very, very identical" with Vajrayana Buddhism

Derek said:

I've been reading Part III of John Reynolds' The Golden Letters...

dzogchungpa said:

BTW, you can see/hear what I was referring to 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]
```

It should start at the right place, but if not it's at 6:55.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, this is his opinion. I think he is completely wrong and overstating the case.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2016 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Coping with Energetic Sensitivity

Content:

Footsteps said:

Some people are extremely sensitive to the energetic wavelengths around them...

How can a person overcome such sensitivities? What can one do to develop a better

filter, or a better resistance to adverse effects of a given energetic landscape?

Malcolm wrote:

Such people have a vatta disorder. Treat accordingly.

Footsteps said:

How does one treat a vatta disorder?

Malcolm wrote:

see an ayurvedic specialist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2016 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

its clearly saying that the teacher induces in the students various experiences simply by placing his awareness in front of them.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not clearly saying this at all. Why? This translation, " Now place your awareness right in the space in front of you, steadily without modification, fixedly without wavering, and clearly without a meditative object." is slightly mistaken.

What it is in fact is an instruction for the students, as indicated by the plural tense of the Tibetan, to place their own rig pa in the sky before them

da khyed rang rnam rig pa mdun gyi nam mkha' la/ bzo med du ce re/ yengs med du hrig ge/ dmigs med du gsal le ba/ 'od ka'i ngang du zhog cig bya

"Now, you all [meaning the students] should look without artifice at [your] vidyā in the sky in front [of you]; vividly without distraction; clearly without support; resting in the state of radiance.

(nyi zla 'od zer . "dang po skye gnas bar do'i khrid yig kun gzhi rang grol ." In snyan brgyud khrid chen bcu gsum skor/. TBRC W30199. 7: 63 - 105. [kaH thog]: [kaH thog dgon pa], [2004?]. [http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O00JR968%7CO00JR96800JR513\\$W30199](http://tbrc.org/link?RID=O00JR968%7CO00JR96800JR513$W30199))

I hope this clears that misconception away.

Whenever I find something a little strange in a translation, I go look at the original text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2016 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

Derek said:

5. Consciousness. In both traditions, the central focus is on consciousness, and in particular on pure consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the focus in Dzogchen is not on consciousness per se (the all-basis, the ālaya), it is on understanding the basis, which is inseparable emptiness and clarity.

Moreover, Trika is grounded in the modified Sāṃkhya of the Shaiva tradition; whereas Dzogchen has its feet firmly planted in Abhidharma and Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2016 at 5:05 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

what about this passage from the kar gling zhi khro?:

Have all your pupils sit in front of you in the posture bearing the seven attributes of Vairocana. Now place your awareness right in the space in front of you, steadily without modification, fixedly without wavering, and clearly without a meditative object. While so doing, given the differences in intellect, in some, a nonconceptual, unmediated, conceptually unstructured reality will arise in their mind-streams. In some there will be a steadiness of awareness. In some, there will be a steady, natural luster of emptiness that is not an emptiness that is nothing; and there will arise a realization that this is awareness itself, it is the nature of the mind. In some, there will arise a sense of straightforward emptiness. In some, appearances and the mind will merge: appearances will not be left outside and awareness will not be left inside. There will arise a sense that they have become inseparably equalized. It is impossible that some such kind of experience will fail to occur.

(from "Natural Liberation: Padmasambhava's Teachings on the Six Bardos" Wisdom Publications 1998, pg 120)

Malcolm wrote:

What about it? Experiences are always occurring, all the time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2016 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Who takes the empowerment? You do. Empowerment is just another form of teaching.

Sherab Dorje said:

Dude, with all respect, you've made your point. Those that heard it and took it to heart... Those that didn't... No need to flog a dead horse!

Malcolm wrote:

There is always a need to flog a dead horse.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2016 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Is the gar asking to send email requests for permission to attend?

Malcolm wrote:

No, you register on the website.

Crazywisdom said:

Melong.com?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzamlings website:

<http://dzamlingsgar.net/en/schedule/icalrepeat.detail/2016/12/28/6591/-/choegyal-namkhai-norbu-yangtig-retreat>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2016 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Oh yeah one of my lamas said blessings in Tilo's song means if you have respect for teacher, lineage and teachings, and put hard efforts into it then you get the result.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, blessings all come from you. Your respect, your efforts. Lamas can't do anything but give you teachings.

conebeckham said:

Though without empowerment, your respect and efforts are insufficient.

Malcolm wrote:

Who takes the empowerment? You do. Empowerment is just another form of teaching.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2016 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

RikudouSennin said:

Is \$1,500 enough to get me to Tenerife from Atlanta and back?

This is essentially all the money I have saved up, will just have to live at bare minimum for the next couple of months to add on to it.

Edit: Just looked at ticket prices, hotels, passports etc. I don't have a chance, enjoy.

Malcolm wrote:

Buy your plane ticket, start a go fund me. You will be able to find some place to stay with some kind person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2016 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Is the gar asking to send email requests for permission to attend?

Malcolm wrote:

No, you register on the website.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2016 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

krodha said:

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 wrote:

This is a very common thing in the community -- using personal communications with ChNN in the attempt to condition others.

krodha said:

Thanks, I wasn't aware it's common, luckily no one does this at our ling in Berkeley.

Malcolm wrote:

If you have ever been on the gakyil, you are more likely to experience this. I have seen every variety of trying to use ChNN's personal communications to manipulate others or promote one's own point of view. In general, I think it is disrespectful of CHNN, of others,

and of the teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2016 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

krodha said:

Come hell or high water I'll be in Tenerife in December. Hope to see some of you there.

Malcolm wrote:

See you there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2016 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

florin said:

But there is the undeniable fact that lots of rinpoches received whole cycles of advanced teachings when they were young and not yet ripe.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, like ChNN, by his own frequent admission.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, September 5th, 2016 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

krodha said:

.

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 said:

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 wrote:

This is a very common thing in the community -- using personal communications with ChNN in the attempt to condition others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 4th, 2016 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: Coping with Energetic Sensitivity

Content:

Footsteps said:

Some people are extremely sensitive to the energetic wavelengths around them...

How can a person overcome such sensitivities? What can one do to develop a better filter, or a better resistance to adverse effects of a given energetic landscape?

Malcolm wrote:

Such people have a vatta disorder. Treat accordingly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 4th, 2016 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 4th, 2016 at 1:22 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is enough drama in the world, who needs more?

maybay said:

Asvaghosa, Abhinavagupta, Thangtong Gyalpo, Chogyam Trungpa, DJK, Ivo, Jundo Cohen, Kim, and me. And possibly Dzogchungpa.

Malcolm wrote:

Good luck.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, September 4th, 2016 at 1:22 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Devotion means you listen to their teachings, and then apply them. That's all. There is nothing more to true devotion than this. The idea that devotion is this big emotional drama is immature.

Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche said:

Recognize your essence in the moment of strong devotion, which is an emotion so powerful that tears come to our eyes and the hairs on the body stand on end. As the third Karmapa said, "In the moment of love, the empty essence dawns nakedly."

Malcolm wrote:

If that is what turns you on. Seems like unnecessary contrivance to me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Rainbow Body in Hindhuism

Content:

Rakz said:

Well according to Dzogchen every single living sentient being is already a rainbow body

florin said:

Yes that is how it is .

One just need to learn to distinguish between this body of light that is our five aggregates and the unchangeable natural state and develop capacity of how to rest in this state instead of the body of light.

Malcolm wrote:

Huh? You mean the five kāyas, five pristine consciousnesses, five lights, and so on are not our unchanging natural state?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

maybay said:

Another aspect of devotion with the intention of receiving blessings is the drama that it brings to the surface.

Malcolm wrote:

There is enough drama in the world, who needs more?

maybay said:

If you suspect that someone may have high realizations, and that they are in an extraordinary position to help beings such as yourself (where other learned teachers might just have stock teachings to impart), then devotion is an important way of framing your interactions. For example, with devotion, you are symbolically gesturing to the master that you see something in them beyond ordinary teachings. It is too often the case that teachers are approached by people with only a curious interest in them and their teachings. Devotion shows the master that you are not just taking another trip through the mall. Through acts of devotion you show you are prepared to commit to a practice, and therefore that they are not wasting their time imparting precious teachings instead of doing their own practice. Blessings, like merit, or even mundane currency, is an intangible and relative good of no ultimate value.

Malcolm wrote:

Devotion means you listen to their teachings, and then apply them. That's all. There is nothing more to true devotion than this. The idea that devotion is this big emotional drama is immature.

maybay said:

A fraudulent teacher will not have the capacity to manage the intensified consciousness produced by devotion, and his organization will show obvious signs of corruption. These signs of corruption are not just an unfortunate by-product of what might have been. They are a valuable warning to anyone else looking to enter the community, and for those inside it too. The more one is familiar with what devotion is, how it works, and what it looks like when it goes wrong, the more you will be able to distinguish authentic and inauthentic Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

This is incredibly naive. It is also a horrible recommendation.

maybay said:

Devotion and the blessings that accrue should be seen as a practice. Something to be taken as seriously as any other practice. It is not a ticket to hysteria and forgetting oneself.

Malcolm wrote:

"Devotion" means practicing. "Blessings" means receiving teachings. Both only come from your side. If you don't receive teachings out of lack of interest, you can have all the emotional devotion you want, but you cannot practice. If you don't practice, you will experience no result.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 3:04 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Oh yeah one of my lamas said blessings in Tilo's song means if you have respect for teacher, lineage and teachings, and put hard efforts into it then you get the result.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, blessings all come from you. Your respect, your efforts. Lamas can't do anything but give you teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 3:02 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

We need a rainbow body tally.

BTW ChNN says the GY in the Yangti-Shitro book is the most profound. In the end, the CN is like this.

Malcolm wrote:

Guru Yoga of White A and Ati Guru Yoga are not exactly the same.

The former (short form) is found in the Short Thun. The latter is the basis of all practices in the DC.

Crazywisdom said:

Referring to the triangle one... Is that what you meant?

Malcolm wrote:

The Guru Yoga of White A, the long form, is included in the collective practices book and the Shitro/Yanti book. This is the one of which ChNN has said belongs to anuyoga. I have some familiarity with it because I have done it in retreat and have received teachings on it (normal way in a group retreat).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

That's at the time of transfer. They talk of dharmakaya appearing as blueness and the form kayas are latent until sentient beings get involved when it can appear as any deity.

Malcolm wrote:

Also Saraha refutes this idea that Mahāmudra realization is the cessation of perception:

“For the knowledge of the ultimate, oh sir, look with your eyes! I didn’t realize anything more than this. If you want realization, that is everything.”

Also Kotalipa:

“From looking with the eye organ, non-dual wisdom is amazing!”

Yangonpa, the famed Drukpa Kagyu master states:

Luminous clarity is without appearances and free from extremes but mahāmudrā is fresh appearance and knowing, and because proliferation is self-liberated, it is different than luminous clarity.

He continues:

That is not the objects of focus or the creation of a deity form, luminous clarity, or emptiness, bliss, non-conceptuality, and so on. There might be a deity form, there might be a ghost. There might be bliss, there might be suffering. There might be appearances, there might be emptiness. There might be luminous clarity, [5/a] there might be signs. There might be conceptuality, there might be non-conceptuality, whatever it may be, it is not established in truth. It is enough in its own state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Correct about what the book says. He's comparing against other cycles and wondering why CN gives a faster schedule than others. The only diff he saw was emphasis on guru, where it goes with Vimalamitra and then to CSW.

Malcolm wrote:

The Chetsun Nyinthig is not a Dzogchen practice, per se. It is a practice of anuyoga, supporting man ngag sde practice. It has some very brief instructions on rushen, trekchö and thögal, but very brief. Khenpo Namdrol might still be trapped in cause and effect vehicles, or he thinks that is what is useful for people, like ChNN.

The most effective practice is Ati Guru Yoga, ChNN style.

Crazywisdom said:

We need a rainbow body tally.

BTW ChNN says the GY in the Yangti-Shitro book is the most profound. In the end, the CN is like this.

Malcolm wrote:

Guru Yoga of White A and Ati Guru Yoga are not exactly the same.

The former (short form) is found in the Short Thun. The latter is the basis of all practices in the DC.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Khenpo Namdrol explained the Chetsun Nyimthig's promise of a swifter realization of rainbow body than other Dzogchen cycles is its emphasis on guru devotion. He said, other than that, it's not that different from other cycles. Perception of wisdom is being asserted as the slower way to go.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no. Chetsun says in the cycle, that meditating on him is the most effective way in this day and age:

“E ma, e ma! Later on in the future, if yogis practicing the essential meaning of the Heart Essence wish for liberation in this life, they should meditate on me, Chetsun Simheśvara. This means doing the full sadhana, not just the ngondro.

Crazywisdom said:

Correct about what the book says. He's comparing against other cycles and wondering why CN gives a faster schedule than others. The only diff he saw was emphasis on guru, where it goes with Vimalamitra and then to CSW.

Malcolm wrote:

The Chetsun Nyinthig is not a Dzogchen practice, per se. It is a practice of anuyoga, supporting man ngag sde practice. It has some very brief instructions on rushen, trekchö and thögal, but very brief. Khenpo Namdrol might still be trapped in cause and effect vehicles, or he thinks that is what is useful for people, like ChNN.

The most effective practice is Ati Guru Yoga, ChNN style.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Reminder: Cessation of perception is what is being asserted as buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

In Hinayāna and Mahāyāna, perhaps. Not Vajrayāna, and definitely not Dzogchen.

Crazywisdom said:

It's in Tilo's song. And that's what the 4th vision is, cessation of phenomena, clarity or whatever. Some say there's a color... But that's about it...

Malcolm wrote:

There is no cessation of perception in the fourth vision. Concerning this Shabkar writes:

It so happens that in the past some practitioners of the Great Perfection have asserted that the kāyas and pristine consciousnesses do not exist within the state of original purity, but this is great error.

And:

The way that great transference body arises:
when all visions have gradually been exhausted,
when one focuses one's consciousness on the appearances strewn about
on the luminous maṇḍala of the five fingers of one's hand,
the environment and inhabitants of the universe
returning from that appearance are perceived as like the moon in the water.
One's body is just a reflection,
self-apparent as the illusory body of pristine consciousness;
externally and internally pellucid; free from being harmed by the four elements;
one obtains a vajra-like body.
One sees one's body as transparent inside and out.
The impure eyes of others cannot see one's body as transparent,
but only the body as it was before;
for example, when the hand of Mutri Tsanpo touched
the body of Master Padmasambhava,
according to account of their meeting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

conebeckham said:

Who am I to know? I was just repeating the words of my Kagyu masters. I will grant that it comes across as somewhat triumphalist.

Malcolm wrote:

Some people like devotion. I prefer direct perception.

Crazywisdom said:

Khenpo Namdrol explained the Chetsun Nyimthig's promise of a swifter realization of

rainbow body than other Dzogchen cycles is its emphasis on guru devotion. He said, other than that, it's not that different from other cycles. Perception of wisdom is being asserted as the slower way to go.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no. Chetsun says in the cycle, that meditating on him is the most effective way in this day and age:

“E ma, e ma! Later on in the future, if yogis practicing the essential meaning of the Heart Essence wish for liberation in this life, they should meditate on me, Chetsun Siṃheśvara. This means doing the full sadhana, not just the ngondro.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 1:55 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Reminder: Cessation of perception is what is being asserted as buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

In Hinayāna and Mahāyāna, perhaps. Not Vajrayāna, and definitely not Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 1:55 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

conebeckham said:

Who am I to know? I was just repeating the words of my Kagyu masters. I will grant that it comes across as somewhat triumphalist.

Malcolm wrote:

Some people like devotion. I prefer direct perception.

maybay said:

I like both.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

That's an interesting theory. But how do you support that? BTW if they Vajradhara isn't being identified as the guru, there's no blessing going to happen and the winds entering the heart will cause anger. It's not that one prays to anyone as a Buddha. Or just prays to Buddha. It has to be a lineage teacher as Vajradhara.

Malcolm wrote:

Or Sakya Paṇḍita, or Guru Rinpoche, or Tsongkhapa, or anyone else you believe has reached Buddhahood.

For myself, I prefer to visualize a white A in a thigle, since I think this is more direct. But the principle is the same. And by the way, I don't mean the heart organ -- if vatta enters that, it is a big problem, so called snying rlung; I mean in the heart center, the center of the body, below the heart and above the diaphragm, roughly between T9 and T8.

Crazywisdom said:

Tilopa just meant your heart, as in deep.

Malcolm wrote:

You can understand it that way, if you choose.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Vasana said:

I'll look up how to do that. For now, I've edited that post and quoted the excerpt in question from Merton.

Malcolm wrote:

<https://tinyurl.com>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Vasana said:

A passage from Merton quoted in the foreword/Intro to Chattel Rinpoche's book, Compassionate action

[url]https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=ZlucT_y2C-sC&pg=PA10&dq=thomas+merton+chatral&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwiH5InUIPHOA

XL3SwKHfWJCIUQuwUIGTAC#v=snippet&q=thomas%20merton%20&f=false[/url]

Malcolm wrote:

Use a tiny URL

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Vasana said:

Dzogchen master Chatral Rinpoche and Catholic contemplative Thomas Merton got along very well and were apparently both quite impressed with each other too.

dzogchungpa said:

Yes, apparently Merton was not hurtin', spiritually speaking.

Vasana said:

Ha! Agreed.

Interestingly enough;

Yet, the most influential contact he [Merton] made was with the Buddhist teacher, Chatral Rinpoche, a monk who had spent more than thirty years in the solitary contemplation that was Merton's only real home in this world. It was Chatral Rinpoche who identified Merton as a pratyekabhudda, and with whom Merton would take a variant of the Bodhisattva's vows, in which he dedicated himself to do all he could to reach enlightenment for the benefit of all beings, in this lifetime or the next.

From :

<http://spiritualnotreligious.blogspot.co.uk/2011/05/thomas-merton-encounter-with-buddhism.html?m=1>

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahahaha, whoever wrote this blog however is an ignoramus:

The Buddha consistently said that his path was not the only path to enlightenment, and that every being must find his own path.

In fact the Buddha said the opposite.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

conebeckham said:

In my tradition, we say that "direct perception" or "naked seeing" can be best achieved if one places one's mind in a state of intense devotion, intense compassion, or intense bliss. It's about praxis. The goal is the same. Devotion on it's own is nice, but it's a means.....

Malcolm wrote:

In my tradition we say that direct perception is best achieved through direct introduction. But we may mean different direct perceptions. Caveat emptor always applies.

conebeckham said:

Indeed! We say direct introduction can be best given in the states mentioned, FWIW.....in fact, Shangpa Ga'uma works exactly that way. Kamtsang also has their methods of "pointing out" that are related to Tantric practice, and the Completion stage, separate from ChagChen Ngedon Gyamtso's path. But who knows if the object being pointed to is the same?

Malcolm wrote:

In this case, it means direct perception of the clarity and empty aspects of the mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

So it is roughly at the level of the xyphoid process, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, September 3rd, 2016 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Jesus, what is T8 and T9? You do not mean thoraic vertebrae, do you?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, between those, in the center of the body. This is the rough location of the heart cakra.

treehuggingoctopus said:

As shown here? Roughly three-four fingers above the navel:

Lovely. I have been doing it wrong for almost a decade now

Malcolm wrote:

As shown there, T5 or so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 11:56 PM

Title: Re: First words of Buddha after enligghenment

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The first words of the Buddha after awakening are reported in the Lalitavistara Sūtra:

The ambrosial Dharma I obtained is
profound, immaculate, luminous, and unconditioned.

Even if I explain it, no one will understand.

I think I shall remain silent in the forest.

That which is free from words cannot be understood through words,
likewise, the nature of phenomena is like space,
totally free of the movements of mind and intellect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

conebeckham said:

Who am I to know? I was just repeating the words of my Kagyu masters. I will grant that it comes across as somewhat triumphalist.

Malcolm wrote:

Some people like devotion. I prefer direct perception.

conebeckham said:

In my tradition, we say that "direct perception" or "naked seeing" can be best achieved if one places one's mind in a state of intense devotion, intense compassion, or intense bliss. It's about praxis. The goal is the same. Devotion on it's own is nice, but it's a means.....

Malcolm wrote:

In my tradition we say that direct perception is best achieved through direct introduction. But we may mean different direct perceptions. Caveat emptor always applies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And by the way, I don't mean the heart organ -- if vatta enters that, it is a big problem, so called snying rlung; I mean in the heart center, the center of the body, below the heart and above the diaphragm, roughly between T9 and T8.

treehuggingoctopus said:

Jesus, what is T8 and T9? You do not mean thoracic vertebrae, do you?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, between those, in the center of the body. This is the rough location of the heart cakra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

conebeckham said:

Who am I to know? I was just repeating the words of my Kagyu masters. I will grant that it comes across as somewhat triumphalist.

Malcolm wrote:

Some people like devotion. I prefer direct perception.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Kagyu believe in using two accumulations. Also in devotion being the best way to realization, as in the stanza from Tilopa about guru's blessing entering your heart. They are visualizing the guru as vajradhara when praying. Tilo also mentions followers of

sutras and tantras can't realize Mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the Kagyus are Kadampa Gradualists. No problem with that.

Tilopa's stanza refers to i) doctrine from the Guhyasamaja, that a very effective way to cause the winds to enter the central channel is to focus on the anahata bindu (mi shig thig le) in the heart, visualized in the form of the guru. It actually has nothing to do with devotion, but everything to do with yogic praxis. ii) it refers to the fact that guru yoga is, for many people, a faster path than the two stages.

Crazywisdom said:

That's an interesting theory. But how do you support that? BTW if they Vajradhara isn't being identified as the guru, there's no blessing going to happen and the winds entering the heart will cause anger. It's not that one prays to anyone as a Buddha. Or just prays to Buddha. It has to be a lineage teacher as Vajradhara.

Malcolm wrote:

Or Sakya Paṇḍita, or Guru Rinpoche, or Tsongkhapa, or anyone else you believe has reached Buddhahood.

For myself, I prefer to visualize a white A in a thigle, since I think this is more direct. But the principle is the same. And by the way, I don't mean the heart organ -- if vatta enters that, it is a big problem, so called snying rlung; I mean in the heart center, the center of the body, below the heart and above the diaphragm, roughly between T9 and T8.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

conebeckham said:

Malcolm, why do you single out the Kagyupas? I'm not butt-hurt, lol, but curious!

Malcolm wrote:

Because they single themselves out. For example, Gyalpo Rinpoche writes:

The manner of explaining the strength, definition and qualities, and the view, meditation and behavior of devotion, etc., in this lineage does not resemble others...

He explained that devotion was a special point of the Kagyu lineage, following Dgongs gcig:

Devotion alone is the method of giving rise to all realization.

He polemically responds to Sakya Paṇḍita, saying the following:

How can there be any doubt, therefore, that supplication to the victorious fathers and sons of the Kagyus will cause the blessings to enter?

And then going on the quote Karma Chagme:

Because a Guru possessing all qualifications today is rare, supplicating the lineage of the victorious fathers and sons of the Kagyus is good on its own. The activity of the Buddhas arrives because of their intent.
So that is why I singled out the Kagyus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Kagyu believe in using two accumulations. Also in devotion being the best way to realization, as in the stanza from Tilopa about guru's blessing entering your heart. They are visualizing the guru as vajradhara when praying. Tilo also mentions followers of sutras and tantras can't realize Mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the Kagyus are Kadampa Gradualists. No problem with that.

Tilopa's stanza refers to i) doctrine from the Guhyasamaja, that a very effective way to cause the winds to enter the central channel is to focus on the anahata bindu (mi shig thig le) in the heart, visualized in the form of the guru. It actually has nothing to do with devotion, but everything to do with yogic praxis. ii) it refers to the fact that guru yoga is, for many people, a faster path than the two stages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

The pope doesn't run a 3 yr retreat. GR is a kagyu master with exceptional siddhis. If you pray to the pope nothing will happen. If you pray to GR you will receive profound lineage blessings.

monktastic said:

If you pray to a dog's tooth with enough devotion, you will "receive" blessings sufficient for realization. If you pray to the pope the full faith that he is a Buddha, methinks something will happen.

Crazywisdom said:

Hope

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that "blessings" come from supplicating gurus or from disciples offering supplications is both equally wrong. The dog tooth story is a perfect example of some of the hardcore silliness we can find in Tibetan Buddhism. It is a tale to silence inquisitive children.

Nevertheless, I will happily sing blessing supplications because I am grateful for the path that my gurus have shown me. But just as I don't really believe that gathering the two accumulations is necessary for buddhahood, likewise, I don't really believe in external blessings.

And the point of my example about the Pope is that he gives blessings a.k.a. benedictions, for a living. It is his main job. This is the Christian approach to spirituality in general, i.e., appealing to a higher power. But the Buddha is not a "higher" power -- he is merely someone who understood his own nature and became free of the afflictions that bound him to samsara. A guru is also not a higher power, he or she is someone that shows us the path. Meeting the path of Dharma is the real blessing, besides which all other so-called "blessings" pale into insignificance.

In any case, it is interesting to note that in the bka' 'gyur, the term byin rlab, brlabs and rlob occur infrequently in the sūtra division. There are 4 instances in the perfection of wisdom section; 51 instances in the Avatamska; 7 instances in the Ratnakuta collection and 53 instances in the general sūtra division. This is out of millions of words.

In the tantra division of course, because it is concerned with ritual actions, primarily, there are 740 instances of this term.

By way of comparison, the term emptiness occurs 27 times in Vinaya, 1000+ times in the PP section; 27 times in the Avatamska, 420 in the Ratnakuta, 1000+ in the general sutra division; and 464 in the tantra division.

When we run a comparative analysis on the tantra division with guru and blessing combined, we find that the "blessing" relationship between guru and disciple is framed as a contractual obligation, as in this passage from the Vajrāmṛta Tantra:

After the disciple fully offers
his wealth to the guru,
the blessings of the guru
should be granted to the sadhaka.

But apart from this passage, there are no others in the tantras themselves. In the commentarial literature, the use of the term "blessings of the guru" are generally restricted to empowerment contexts. But of course, there are rare statements such as Virupa's:

Siddhi is obtained in an instant,
based on the blessings of the guru.

Naturally, as we move down into the commentaries on lower tantra, yoga tantra on down, references to the blessings of the guru disappear.

Such references are only found in the anuttarayoga tantra commentaries because guru

yoga is strictly an highest yoga tantra thing.

Finally, the term "guru endowed with the lineage of blessings" entirely refers, in Indian literature, to someone who is actually authorized to bestow this or that empowerment, i.e. someone who has the adhiṣṭhāna (n. standing by , being at hand , approach ; standing or resting upon ; a basis , base ; the standing-place of the warrior upon the car Sa1mavBr. ; a position , site , residence , abode , seat ; a settlement , town , standing over ; government , authority , power ; a precedent , rule ; a benediction Buddh.) of the lineage.

Now of course, things in Tibet are different, especially in the Kagyu school, and Tibetans overall have moved way beyond the limited notion of "blessings" found in the Indian canon, where we can see common Tibetans (the prayer wheel spinning types) placing fervent, often blind, devotion in tulkus, abbots, geshe, and so on., whether deserved or not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 9:17 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

heart said:

Florin, I think you will be very surprised when you receive a full transmission of a Dzogchen cycle, in particular a Nyingtik cycle. You seem to be an idealist holding a banner for the ever evasive "pure Dzogchen". I am afraid that really don't exist in the way you think. Dzogchen is a lot more pragmatik than you think.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Florin, bless his heart, is a staunch Valbyista.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 9:15 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

florin said:

You are free to do dzogchen ngondro from a sutra perspective...

But in my opinion we should at least consider using them in their proper context.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahaha, you are a really funny guy. You think you know Dzogchen even better than Longchenpa. Hahahahahaha. Longchenpa is just echoing Vimalamitra in the commentary on the sgra thal 'gyur. But I forgot, if it is isn't Semde, for you it is not really Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

maybay said:

You said that [blessings] have no function at all.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I actually said that "blessing" means to place the mind on profound Dharma topics according to definition given by Alak Kenkar Rinpoche (the reincarnation of Do Khyentse Yeshe Dorje) in his bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo, or alternately, the activities that buddhas perform on our behalf; not the naive kind of "blessings" some people here believe in.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

If you pray to the pope nothing will happen. If you pray to GR you will receive profound lineage blessings.

Malcolm wrote:

How do you know. Did you try? After all, the Pope has millions of disciples.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 7:03 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As far as Garchen Rinpoche goes. He is a very nice person who has benefitted many thousands of people. But then, so has the Pope, etc.

maybay said:

If this says anything its that function and substance are for the most part independent of one another.

Malcolm wrote:

Why? Who says that Garchen is not a bodhisattva, like the Pope.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, I always find guru fundamentalism astonishing in people who likewise consider themselves to have rejected blind faith ala Christianity, etc.

maybay said:

I don't think its the same thing. Christian faith is founded on one giant mistake. What you're suggesting is we pack up and go home on Garchen Rinpoche because of one out of a million things he's said. Or because his Sangha doesn't debate anymore.

Malcolm wrote:

I was not talking about them, I was talking about the more credulous here among us.

As far as Garchen Rinpoche goes. He is a very nice person who has benefitted many thousands of people. But then, so has the Pope, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But the idea that we are actually removing someone else's negative karma is not the way things work, according to what I understand, and I have never seen a convincing explanation to the contrary.

maybay said:

Nevertheless, receiving blessings and creating a karmic connection with realized masters is a simple, powerful method that avoids the pitfalls of narrow thinking. Its like aiming for rebirth in Sukhavati. It may not be the final destination but its acceptable. If you have the capacity to do more then there's no problem here either.

Malcolm wrote:

We are not talking about avoiding the pitfalls of narrow thinking, rather we are avoiding the pitfalls of naive belief in things that have no function at all.

Honestly, I always find guru fundamentalism astonishing in people who likewise consider themselves to have rejected blind faith ala Christianity, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: Abbott chops off finger as a devotional practice

Content:

Virgo said:

This kind of practice is very wrong. Buddha does not require your finger/s.

Virgo

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. Torturing the aggregates is definitely not the Buddha's intent.

dzogchungpa said:

Veganism is right out then, I guess.

Malcolm wrote:

i think so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

florin said:

Dzogchen ngondro is for developing capacity to discover and rest in the natural state.

Malcolm wrote:

The different rushans have different purposes, and purify different things. They have both relative and ultimate benefits.

For example, the rushan of the body, according to Longchenpa, has the following benefits:

From the two necessities in the preliminary of the body, the common purpose is attachment to the body is reversed, and obstacles are pacified. Common to both of those, misdeeds of the body are purified.

The supreme purpose is that one will never enter into the city of the womb, be liberated as a nirmānakāya. Common to both of those, one will become non-dual with the vajra body of all the buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

florin said:

That all phenomena are the energy of self-originated wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the common view of all the higher tantras.

florin said:

Although the higher tantras have some understanding of the real condition they consider that the phenomena of the aggregates and their corresponding consciousnesses are samsaric manifestations which require purification...

Malcolm wrote:

So does Dzogchen. What do you think rushen is for? It is a kind of purification for eliminating rebirth in the six realms.

Don't confuse the basis with the path and result. As the Single Son of All the Buddhas Tantra states,
The mind series is for the intellectual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: Abbott chops off finger as a devotional practice

Content:

Virgo said:

This kind of practice is very wrong. Buddha does not require your finger/s.

Virgo

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. Torturing the aggregates is definitely not the Buddha's intent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

florin said:

Sure.

But from what i could see in dzogchen the aggregates receive a different treatment and meaning than in the rest of approaches.

Malcolm wrote:

What do you mean?

florin said:

That all phenomena are the energy of self-originated wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the common view of all the higher tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

I am not going to throw in the towel just yet. When we practise Shitro with the intention of helping the deceased, we **are** actually purifying their karma, are we not? (Please see Teachings on Shitro and Yangti, pp. 86-87.)

Malcolm wrote:

What we are doing is creating a dependent origination for them to take rebirth in higher realms. But our practice is not going to overwhelm their karma. For example, if we do Shitro for Hitler, Stalin and Mao, people who hate the Dharma, do you really think there will be much effect?

\We have to be sensible. For example, Rinpoche has said many times that reading the Tibetan Book of the Dead for someone who has not received and practiced Shitro is useless (as is reading it in Tibetan for English speakers, for example).

Because beings in the bardo have seven times more clarity, through their clairvoyance, they know when we are doing Shitro for them, and this can create a cause for their eventual liberation through mantra, etc., especially if they are a practitioner. But the idea that we are actually removing someone else's negative karma is not the way things work, according to what I understand, and I have never seen a convincing explanation to the contrary.

treehuggingoctopus said:

Thanks, Malcolm. I very much appreciate your candour.

Malcolm wrote:

All of these Shitro rituals for guiding the dead come from the Sarvadurgati-parishodana tantra, originally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

florin said:

So are you saying that the naked experience of sensation, which is a direct perception, is still mind but a nonconceptual mind ?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. This is also stated quite clearly in Dzogchen tantras.

florin said:

Sure.

But from what I could see in dzogchen the aggregates receive a different treatment and meaning than in the rest of approaches.

Malcolm wrote:

What do you mean?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, September 2nd, 2016 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

What about doing Mandarava for the sake of another person, though?

Malcolm wrote:

In this case you are trying to strengthen their five elements. Enhancing another's health through mantra and visualization is one thing. But removing their two obscurations is quite another. The former is done easily, the latter cannot be done at all.

treehuggingoctopus said:

I am not going to throw in the towel just yet. When we practise Shitro with the intention of helping the deceased, we *are* actually purifying their karma, are we not? (Please see Teachings on Shitro and Yangti, pp. 86-87.)

Malcolm wrote:

What we are doing is creating a dependent origination for them to take rebirth in higher realms. But our practice is not going to overwhelm their karma. For example, if we do Shitro for Hitler, Stalin and Mao, people who hate the Dharma, do you really think there will be much effect?

We have to be sensible. For example, Rinpoche has said many times that reading the Tibetan Book of the Dead for someone who has not received and practiced Shitro is useless (as is reading it in Tibetan for English speakers, for example).

Because beings in the bardo have seven times more clarity, through their clairvoyance, they know when we are doing Shitro for them, and this can create a cause for their eventual liberation through mantra, etc., especially if they are a practitioner. But the

idea that we are actually removing someone else's negative karma is not the way things work, according to what I understand, and I have never seen a convincing explanation to the contrary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

florin said:

So are you saying that the naked experience of sensation, which is a direct perception, is still mind but a nonconceptual mind ?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. This is also stated quite clearly in Dzogchen tantras.

Sherab Dorje said:

In Theravada Abhidhamma too.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't care much about Abhidhamma, it is not relevant to my practice. Just saying...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

florin said:

So are you saying that the naked experience of sensation, which is a direct perception, is still mind but a nonconceptual mind ?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. This is also stated quite clearly in Dzogchen tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

conebeckham said:

Okay, so what, then, is this blessing that is "given" and "received?"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 10:25 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Sensation does not require conceptualisation, but the experience of sensation (sweetness) does.

florin said:

And how is a sensation different from the experience of sensation ?

To me , when mind is engaged by saying "this is sweet" and restricting the appearance of sensation to this frame of reference , is what i would call conceptualization . But i would not say that the naked experience of sensation , which is prior to mind being engaged , is the conceptualization itself.

Malcolm wrote:

A direct perception is not prior to the mind, per se. A direct perception is a nonconceptual mind. A nonconceptual mind does however exist prior to the arising of the mental faculty, manas, which interprets that nonconceptual mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

What about doing Mandarava for the sake of another person, though?

Malcolm wrote:

In this case you are trying to strengthen their five elements. Enhancing another's health through mantra and visualization is one thing. But removing their two obscurations is quite another. The former is done easily, the latter cannot be done at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

maybay said:

What is Viṣṭadvaita [Krishnamācārya's view]?

Malcolm wrote:

Qualified nondualism, formulated by Ramanuja — characteristic of Vaishnava philosophy in general.

monktastic said:
I think it's missing a syllable: viśiṣṭādvaita.

Malcolm wrote:
yup

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 5:04 AM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that
Content:
Tsongkhapafan said:
You are too dismissive of other people's understandings and experiences.

Malcolm wrote:
You are too credulous.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 5:03 AM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that
Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:
Perhaps you'd be better off trying to understand the views of a great master rather than disparaging them? You might learn something.

Malcolm wrote:
So you accept what Garchen Rinpoche is here presented as saying? Good for you. I don't.

Tsongkhapafan said:
Have you really thought about how it might be true? It's no good just casually dismissing it. A great Master's word are worth considering because they don't say things for no reason, so why do you think he said this?

Malcolm wrote:
Buddha cannot enter a samadhi which causes people to realize selflessness. Why would we think anyone else would be able to?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 1:14 AM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that
Content:

Crazywisdom said:

What about this bit on the guru over deity? Is this the correct sense?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

maybay said:

You've lumped colloquial language and grammatical lapses together like they are both faults.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Kumāṛila did -- get some glasses.

maybay said:

Ok, but why make a point of them unless they were an issue. Being critical of grammatical lapses is not a wrong view.

Malcolm wrote:

Kumāṛila was someone who argued the Vedas were perfect because their language perfect, and therefore, the teachings contained in them was perfect because the Vedas are considered to self-existing. On the other hand, the texts of the Buddhists and Jains, his thinking ran, were imperfect and their doctrines were imperfect because they used colloquial language and had bad grammar.

Google it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

maybay said:

By the way, earlier in the thread I asked what you learnt from Kṛṣṇamācārya's student.

Malcolm wrote:

Yoga, Sāṃkhya and Advaita [his own view], with a smattering of Viṣṭadvaita [Kṛṣṇamācārya's view].

maybay said:

What is Viṣṭadvaita [Krishnamācārya's view]?

Malcolm wrote:

Qualified nondualism, formulated by Ramanuja — characteristic of Vaishnava philosophy in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Just recall, Dzogchungpa, you brought it up, so the response to this is on your head.

dzogchungpa said:

Um, no, gzodzilpa did.

Malcolm wrote:

He indeed brought it up, and asked a question, you brought it up as a challenge to my response to his post, as you often do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If we, in a state of delusion, think we are in fact really removing the illnesses and misery of others through gtong len practice, for example, we have not understood one word of what gtong len teachings are in actuality— a method of developing the courage necessary to make the leap from aspirational bodhicitta to engaged bodhicitta.

treehuggingoctopus said:

And yet we did the Chang Chog Shitro today, deluded oafs that most of us are...

Malcolm wrote:

Chang chog is a kind of rite where the ghandarva of a deceased person is summoned, and given instructions, as well as put through some empowerment -like procedures (but they are not actual empowerments) so that their obscurations are purified. But is not passive, you are not doing it FOR them, you are GUIDING them through the rites in the same way a guru guides you through visualizations in an empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is one of the key advantages of Dzogchen tantras, in that they go through the 60 wrong views prevalent in India, step by step, identifying people such as the founder of Advaita, Shankarācārya, and other Hindu polemicists, such as Kumāṛila Bhaṭṭa, an exponent of Purvamimamsa who studied directly with Dharmakīrti, who criticized Buddhists and Jains for using colloquial language and for grammatical lapses.

maybay said:

You've lumped colloquial language and grammatical lapses together like they are both faults.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Kumāṛila did -- get some glasses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

. I think what gets forgotten here is that what is being described might be beyond the understanding of ordinary people...

Malcolm wrote:

You mean the ordinary people who are supposedly freed from self-grasping because some yogi enters samadhi on mahāmudra? Just recall, Dzogchungpa, you brought it up, so the response to this is on your head. There is a reason why a master with students ceases to debate after a time. Your penchant for stirring controversy actually damages others.

maybay said:

Its ironic that you can speak from Dzogchungpa's experience, but deny Garchen Rinpoche that prerogative.

Malcolm wrote:

Not denying anyone anything. The way GR's statement is presented is as an actual objective fact "Do this, this happens." It was not presented as some kind of subjective path experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Crazywisdom said:
It gets translated as following the guru for a long time.

Malcolm wrote:
Time means the third empowerment. Whatever translation you read, the translator did not understand the sense of the passage.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 12:43 AM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, many students of Buddhadharma are insufficiently educated in non-Buddhist tenets, and thus do not observe wrong views that creep into their understanding.

maybay said:
By the way, earlier in the thread I asked what you learnt from Krsnamacarya's student.

Malcolm wrote:
Yoga, Saṃkhya and Advaita [his own view], with a smattering of Viṣṭadvaita [Krishnamācārya's view].

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, September 1st, 2016 at 12:00 AM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that
Content:

florin said:
But how can G R's remarks be so heretical ?
Unless the people who are translating him don't understand his instructions...

treehuggingoctopus said:
They need not be heretical, you know. His saying that "the ground of our minds is the same" may be construed as perfectly orthodox (meaning there is just one nature of the mind, not that we are all a Brahman-like multientity) -- and the same applies to the instructions he has received from Khenpo Munsel (see here: <https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=16164&p=226936>).

Even this bit does not necessarily suggest that we are all Borg:

Garchen Rinpoche said:
[...]the essence of the suffering of the sentient beings of the three realms and the essence of our own suffering is the same. If you see them to be the same, if you see them as being non-dual, and then meditate on that suffering, in the mind's natural state, that suffering goes away. At that moment, you have been able to lessen the suffering of all sentient beings of the three realms, all at once.

treehuggingoctopus said:

I mean, if you can dedicate your practice for the benefit of others (and they do benefit from it somehow), why would you not be able to use tonglen like that? We are all connected, after all.

Malcolm wrote:

If we understand such instructions as being an experience on the path, with no real function outside of the practitioner's personal experience, there is no problem with such instructions. For example, it is well known that buddhas only see sentient beings as buddhas. But the fact that buddhas see us as buddhas does not diminish our own obscured experience, our own impure vision, one iota.

If we, in a state of delusion, think we are in fact really removing the illnesses and misery of others through gtong len practice, for example, we have not understood one word of what gtong len teachings are in actuality— a method of developing the courage necessary to make the leap from aspirational bodhicitta to engaged bodhicitta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

. I think what gets forgotten here is that what is being described might be beyond the understanding of ordinary people...

Malcolm wrote:

You mean the ordinary people who are supposedly freed from self-grasping because some yogi enters samadhi on mahāmudra? Just recall, Dzogchungpa, you brought it up, so the response to this is on your head. There is a reason why a master with students ceases to debate after a time. Your penchant for stirring controversy actually damages others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 11:46 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Here's another thing about guru yoga. Sure Hevajra says blessing comes from making offerings to the guru and one's own merit. But I'd argue the effect or feeling you get from any guru yoga you can also get from visualization of one hand implement of a deity. So all these mandala offerings and beseeching prayers to transfer blessing are really doing something else: they are habituating you to want it so bad you won't quit. Dzogchen is doing GY like my hand implement. It's reasoning what is the essence of the guru and the

lineage and boiling it down to a symbol. If a master can make all that clear, mother that's an amazing master. The others are running an outfit, with teaching policies and such, based only on ancient attitudes, like Olympic repetitions.

Malcolm wrote:

Specifically, the Hevajra Tantra states:

Here there is no method and wisdom,
the appearance of true reality
can't be described by another,
the connate cannot be found anywhere,
but one can understand it in dependence on the Guru,
time and method, and from one's merit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

I agree. The texts are the only way to separate the teaching from the innovations that creep in to these little semi formal private interviews and intimate instructions.

maybay said:

"The texts" abound with controversy. The error is not in not fact checking teachings, its in drawing your own conclusions about their applicability based on your experience of them alone, a naïveté the Zen school is renowned for.

Astus said:

Isn't it the Dalai Lama who urges return to Nalanda style Buddhism when teachers were proficient in engaging with non-Buddhist thinkers? I think the error that seems to be in Garchen Rinpoche's teaching comes from being surrounded only by Buddhists. I see similar teachings in East Asian Buddhism as well that can be easily interpreted as a sort of substance/substratum doctrine. But again, I attribute the development of such terminology to the lack of an opposite party that teaches any type of eternal spirit theory, because without them there is no reason to be careful and strict in how one teaches the Dharma. Apparently in India they had to keep the sword of wisdom sharp to cut off all sorts of wrong views, and there was no place for anything that even resembles an atman.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, many students of Buddhadharma are insufficiently educated in non-Buddhist tenets, and thus do not observe wrong views that creep into their understanding. Combine this with the attitude that one's guru cannot possibly be incorrect with respect to any aspect of the Dharma, and one can see that there is a great possibility for many people to adopt many inferior views. This is one of the key advantages of Dzogchen tantras, in that they go through the 60 wrong views prevalent in India, step by step,

identifying people such as the founder of Advaita, Shankarācarya, and other Hindu polemicists, such as Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, an exponent of Purvamimamsa who studied directly with Dharmakīrti, who criticized Buddhists and Jains for using colloquial language and for grammatical lapses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Mahamudra same as Dzogchen?

Content:

JAC72 said:

Just curious what people think in terms of the practice and result. Do both Dzogchen and Mahamudra lead to the same kind of awakening?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. But their paths are quite different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

GR said something similar to me in the past. I asked about guru yoga and why it works. He said bc the dharmakaya is all pervasive. I said that sounds like Hindu Brahman, which I knew something about. He said here we mean God is not a creator of that what Buddha means by God is cause and effect. They say he's realized. He definitely has special qualities.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha told us we must test any teachings the way a goldsmith tests gold. This does not pass my assay.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 8:18 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

gzodzilpa said:

In light of this discussion on the non-actual transference of things like "blessings", what does Garchen Rinpoche mean when he says:

"When you abide within a state of mahamudra without any grasping or thinking at all, within that nature the vows of the three levels of the path are one. And then there are sentient beings who have not realized that, so great compassion then arises for those sentient beings. And because our minds are connected and because you rest in the

nature of the mind, if you pervade the mind of beings with bodhicitta then in each session of practice you can destroy the self-grasping of countless sentient beings. So developing the stages of practice will actually produce such a power, therefore I am very grateful for such a curriculum."

Malcolm wrote:

If this really was true, then there would no longer be any reason for samsara now, would there? So when a guru says something, even a guru as revered as Garchen Rinpoche, for whom I have great respect, we have to subject it to reasoning and not merely be content with nice sounding platitudes that make us feel warm and fuzzy.

The alternative explanation is that so few people are capable of such an equipoise, Buddhas included, as to render it meaningless.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Perhaps you'd be better off trying to understand the views of a great master rather than disparaging them? You might learn something.

Malcolm wrote:

So you accept what Garchen Rinpoche is here presented as saying? Good for you. I don't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Interest in Dharma doesn't exist from it's own side; even our interest develops from receiving Buddha's blessings.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a nonsense argument, a complete non sequitur.

Tsongkhapafan said:

I'm not saying that Buddhas liberate us with no effort on our part, that's your misunderstanding of what I'm saying. It's a co-operative effort - the Buddhas provide teachings, blessings and emanations and we practise the path.

Malcolm wrote:

In other words, no matter what buddhas may do or not, it is of no use to us unless we practice the path they present.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 8:12 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness: the reality beyond reality

Content:

Stewart said:

To be fair, this teaching would most likely have been given by Rinpoche in Tibetan, translated into English, then was definitely edited by someone for his first book

Malcolm wrote:

Fair enough.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 11:08 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

gzodzilpa said:

When our local khenpo gets back from Tibet I'll ask him, he has some ties to Garchen and might have a novel interpretation.

dzogchungpa said:

Can you also ask him about this explanation of tonglen:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=16164&p=226936>

and this statement: 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.

while you're at it?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this doctrine is equally problematical for so many reasons, not least of which are the personal obscurations sentient beings possess which would prevent them from receiving this all-embracing universal love via the basis.

I am not sure what it was in Tibetan Garchen Rinpoche might have said. Thus, while I can comment on the doctrine of those statements presented to me, I cannot comment on Garchen Rinpoche's actual point of view since I have never seen in his own writing such dictums, nor have I heard them spoken, in person or by recording. Thus are the vicissitudes of not listening to gurus in languages we understand and depending on others to interpret their words for us.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 6:48 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Yes, it is good that we have people like you to subject our teachers' statements to reasoning for us.

Malcolm wrote:

Someone has to, since, apparently, some of you won't.

But there are a great number of who prefer platitudes to liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 6:21 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

gzodzilpa said:

In light of this discussion on the non-actual transference of things like "blessings", what does Garchen Rinpoche mean when he says:

"When you abide within a state of mahamudra without any grasping or thinking at all, within that nature the vows of the three levels of the path are one. And then there are sentient beings who have not realized that, so great compassion then arises for those sentient beings. And because our minds are connected and because you rest in the nature of the mind, if you pervade the mind of beings with bodhicitta then in each session of practice you can destroy the self-grasping of countless sentient beings. So developing the stages of practice will actually produce such a power, therefore I am very grateful for such a curriculum."

Malcolm wrote:

If this really was true, then there would no longer be any reason for samsara now, would there? So when a guru says something, even a guru as revered as Garchen Rinpoche, for whom I have great respect, we have to subject it to reasoning and not merely be content with nice sounding platitudes that make us feel warm and fuzzy.

The alternative explanation is that so few people are capable of such an equipoise, Buddhas included, as to render it meaningless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

conebeckham said:

Now we're getting somewhere!

The mind transformed from one state to another state---through the inspiration of holy beings....show me where something is transmitted from such holy beings to ourselves, to transform our minds. Whose inspiration are you speaking of? The inspiration we, as disciples, feel? The inspiration of our gurus? Think carefully about this.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Inspiration is itself a product of receiving blessings from enlightened beings. How can we receive inspiration from holy beings if there's no FROM? Of course there is a transmission. You are right though, there are many different levels of meaning that need to be understood.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, any blessings you receive from a buddha comes from your own interest in the Dharma. If you are not interested, there is no way a Buddha can force you to be interested. As they say, you can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make him drink.

Buddhas are not like momma cats that pick their kittens up by the neck and carry them to a safe place. Again, that is a Christian view, not a Buddhist one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, according to the sūtra abhisamaya presented by Maitreyanatha. But this is irrelevant to Vajrayāna and Dzogchen.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Completely mistaken. You will ever attain enlightenment without bodhichitta and without these levels. There is no enlightenment without bodhichitta, there are no Tantric realisations without it.

Malcolm wrote:

I never said we did not have to have bodhicitta. I said that the presentation of the paths and stage presented in the Abhisamayalaṃkāra, including the 22 bodhicittas are irrelevant to Vajrayāna and Dzogchen. The Abhisamayalaṃkāra is a presentation of the vehicle of the cause. It is not relevant the vehicle of transformation (general Vajrayāna) or the vehicle of self-liberation (Atiyoga).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Also, mere intellectual understanding of Dharma is never going to remove suffering and its causes from our minds. You can debate endlessly on this forum but it's never going to end samsara.

Malcolm wrote:

You can hope for all the blessings you want, but it will never end your samsara. Your view is fundamentally Christian, hoping for external blessings for your salvation. What a pity.

Tsongkhapafan said:

That's your mistaken interpretation of what I've said. You don't understand what blessings are so how can you discuss my view?

Malcolm wrote:

I know what the masters of the past have said blessings are, and what they say and what you say do not correspond. You are relying on your own unenlightened experience as a proof of your tenet. I am relying on the definitions provided to us by realized Indian Panditas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Also, mere intellectual understanding of Dharma is never going to remove suffering and its causes from our minds. You can debate endlessly on this forum but it's never going to end samsara.

Malcolm wrote:

You can hope for all the blessings you want, but it will never end your samsara. Your view is fundamentally Christian, hoping for external blessings for your salvation. What a pity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

[
There is something new.

Malcolm wrote:

No. Buddha qualities are not something new, added to a sentient being. They are revealed through the process of stripping away the two obscurations that make a sentient being a sentient being.

Tsongkhapa said:

There's nothing 'added' to a sentient being, but it is new. Sangye means 'purified and gathered'

Malcolm wrote:

Sangs means purified it is true, but rgyas in fact means "to expand" -- hence sangs rgyas means "Purification of afflictions, expansion of pristine consciousness."

Tsongkhapa said:

There are 22 levels of bodhicitta which are developed through training, so it's not merely a matter of purifying the mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, according to the sūtra abhisamaya presented by Maitreyanatha. But this is irrelevant to Vajrayāna and Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

Wow, I'm completely amazed. You don't know what blessings are from your own experience but have to refer to dictionary definitions?

Malcolm wrote:

The works of the masters included in the bstan 'gyur serve to correct our (in this case your) mistaken interpretation of our experiences. I am surprised you a) do not know this b) do not accept this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

There's a nice discussion of this in chapter 6 of CTR's Profound Treasury volume 3, "Seven Aspects of Vajrayana: The Space before First Thought".

BTW, it appears that the entire chapter can be read here:

<https://books.google.com/books?id=0QHEAwAAQBAJ&pg=PT137>

florin said:

So basically, CTR is saying that the atmosphere of blessing is generated by one's own mind and comes about as a result of one's training.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. That is why we are nang pas, insiders, not phyi pas, outsiders.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Byin means, according to Kenkar, "The ability or power of being able to transform the thoughts or vision of others."

Rlob means similarly, "granting or transforming."

I am not sure why people waste their time with Duff when they could just read what Kenkar says about these words.

By the same token, mos pa means "mental confidence or mental yearning"; gus pa "mental bowing."

conebeckham said:

Duff is on my Phone. I don't have Kenkar.

LOL

I should get Kenkar's work, I suppose, eh?

Malcolm wrote:

Basic problem with Duff is that he takes Das as reliable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: Should emptiness be discussed online at all?

Content:

AlexMcLeod said:

Again, I'm only talking about the tendency to belittle the prerequisite practices and understandings by taking the stance that they don't matter because Emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

I just don't see that here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

conebeckham said:

Interestingly, the Tibetan word byin.brlabs. is glossed as "Blessing" but Tony Duff glosses brlabs.pa/rlob.pa as "to be touched by something else from a distance and affected by it."

"Being affected by" is certainly a cornerstone of Dharma, interdependence, etc., but this does not mean something is transferred or transmitted from one entity to another.

My interpretation is that devotion is both cause and result. It is the result of hearing, reflecting, and meditating, and it is a contributing cause of realization.

Devotion is mos.gus., by the way. mos.pa meaning "longing" and gus.pa meaning "respect."

Malcolm wrote:

Byin means, according to Kenkar, "The ability or power of being able to transform the thoughts or vision of others."

Rlob means similarly, "granting or transforming."

I am not sure why people waste their time with Duff when they could just read what Kenkar says about these words.

By the same token, mos pa means "mental confidence or mental yearning"; gus pa "mental bowing."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

florin said:

Thanks.

And since Buddhas activities are unceasing means that for as long as we stay connected to the teachings we are by implication connected to their activities(blessings).

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. However, what is the highest and best activity of the buddhas? Giving teachings. So of course, we can regard the teachings of the Buddha as a blessing. But there is no force nor blessing that will allow us to realize the meaning of those teachings unless we ourselves put them into practice. So in reality, blessings still come from us, not from the buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What are blessings? Some kind of vibration?

florin said:

I don't know.You tell me.

They are present in tantra and dzogchen alike and i've heard it numerous times that they are responsible for the state of realization.

heart said:

Blessing means that you have a direct experience of what your master teach you or taught you which greatly inspires you. Nothing gets transferred.

/magnus

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness: the reality beyond reality

Content:

Ngwang tenzin said:

What's the difference between emptiness and clarity?

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is the absence of the four extremes in a mind stream. Clarity is the mind's

capacity to illuminate objects. They are inseparable. Rocks don't have clarity, being inert, but they are empty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

florin said:

I don't know. You tell me.

They are present in tantra and dzogchen alike and i've heard it numerous times that they are responsible for the state of realization.

heart said:

Blessing means that you have a direct experience of what your master teach you or taught you which greatly inspires you. Nothing gets transferred.

/magnus

florin said:

But what do they mean when they use expressions like "blessings of the lineage" ? Or the situation when people do GY and they say "all of a sudden i felt this or that , or this and that happen, which were none other than the blessings of my teacher " ?

Malcolm wrote:

Following my post above, it simple means that they practice a path through their own interest, and reaped some of the fruits that path offered, which in humility, they attribute to their teacher as the source of the teachings they practice. But there is no actual blessing "vibration" or "force," like the Hindus believe, for example, their shaktipat, etc. Nevertheless, people will continue to believe this silliness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

krodha said:

You seem to be arguing for no reason at this point.

Malcolm wrote:

It's a Greek thing.

Sherab Dorje said:

A Greek thing? Really?

Malcolm wrote:

By your own admission, many times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 31st, 2016 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

florin said:

But the blessings get transferred.

If there are no blessings how can one realize the state of the real teacher ?

Malcolm wrote:

What are blessings? Some kind of vibration?

florin said:

I don't know. You tell me.

They are present in tantra and dzogchen alike and i've heard it numerous times that they are responsible for the state of realization.

Malcolm wrote:

As ChNN says, if you want a blessing, go get a lama to pat you on the head. But "blessings" of this kind are not something serious.

First, we have to look at what the word really means. According to Alak Kenkar's dictionary, *Bod rgya tshig mdzod*, "A blessing (*byin brlabs*, *adhiṣṭhānam*) is the power of dwelling on a topic of the Dharma of the noble path." In other words, if you dwell on the topics of Dzogchen teachings, or any of the Buddha's teaching, that in itself is a "blessing."

Alak Kenkar adds another entry, "the four blessings" (*byin rlabs bzhi*), which are the blessing of truth, the blessing of generosity, the blessing of pacification, and the blessing of wisdom.

The "blessing of wisdom," according to the only source in the *bstan 'gyur* which defines it, Dharmakīrti's *Jātakamālaṭīkā*, simply means that among the six perfections, those inclined towards wisdom maintain the perfection of wisdom.

So according to these definitions, blessings refer to one's own interest in the path.

The commentary on the *Ratnavali* has another good definition of "blessings":

A "blessing" is any activity performed by the buddhas for bodhisattvas or done by them for the benefit of sentient beings."

So here, a blessing means some activity buddhas do on behalf of bodhisattvas or sentient beings. But it certainly does not mean that buddhas and bodhisattvas have the capacity to transfer their own realization to another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2016 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

krodha said:

You seem to be arguing for no reason at this point.

Malcolm wrote:

It's a Greek thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2016 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Please present a statement from tantra where it says the Buddha can transfer his realization to another.

florin said:

But the blessings get transferred.

If there are no blessings how can one realize the state of the real teacher ?

Malcolm wrote:

What are blessings? Some kind of vibration?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2016 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness: the reality beyond reality

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Stong pa translates śūnya. Nyid translates tā = śūnyatā. The first part means "empty," the tā suffix is equivalent to "ness" in English, hence the term "emptiness" is really the most accurate translation of that term into English.

Here, Mingyur Rinpoche is not carefully distinguishing two different things: 1) the experience of nonconceptuality, which is often termed "the experience of emptiness" in Tibetan texts, and 2) the emptiness which is the doctrine of the Prajñāpāramitā sūtras and Madhyamaka. The latter cannot be experienced in conceptually in meditation. The

former can.

Lucas Oliveira said:

Emptiness: the reality beyond reality

Mingyur Rinpoche explains emptiness, "one of the most misunderstood words" of Buddhist philosophy

“The sense of openness people experience when they simply rest their minds is known in Buddhism as emptiness, which is probably one of the most misunderstood words in Buddhist philosophy. It is hard enough for Buddhists to understand the term, but Western readers have an even more difficult time, because many of the early translations of Sanskrit and Tibetan texts interpreted emptiness as “the Void” or nothingness—mistakenly equating emptiness with the idea that nothing at all exists. Nothing could be further from the truth the Buddha sought to describe.

While the Buddha did teach that the nature of mind—in fact the nature of all phenomena—is emptiness, he didn’t mean that their nature was truly empty, like a vacuum. He said it was emptiness, which in the Tibetan language is made up of two words: tongpa-nyi. The word tongpa means “empty”, but only in the sense of something beyond our ability to perceive with our senses and our capacity to conceptualize. Maybe a better translation would be “inconceivable” or “unnamable.” The word nyi, meanwhile, doesn’t have any particular meaning in everyday Tibetan conversation. But when added to another word it conveys a sense of “possibility”—a sense that anything can arise, anything can happen. So when Buddhist talk about emptiness, we don’t mean nothingness, but rather an unlimited potential for anything to appear, change, or disappear.

Source English: <http://inthefootstepsofthebuddha.com/an-exercise-in-emptiness/>

Source in Portuguese: <http://dharma-log.com/2016/07/27/mingyur-rinpoche-explica-vacuidade-filosofia-budista/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2016 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Should emptiness be discussed online at all?

Content:

AlexMcLeod said:

Bringing Emptiness into conversation about ethics, for instance, is inappropriate, and possibly purposefully misleading. That is all I've been saying.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all. Aryadeva states, for example, when confronted with a choice to choose ethics or choose emptiness, his choice is emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2016 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha could't do that

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

[

There is something new.

Malcolm wrote:

No. Buddha qualities are not something new, added to a sentient being. They are revealed through the process of stripping away the two obscurations that make a sentient being a sentient being.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2016 at 8:40 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha could't do that

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Please present a statement from tantra where it says the Buddha can transfer his realization to another.

Tsongkhapafan said:

It's not explicitly mentioned...

Malcolm wrote:

Then it is not mentioned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2016 at 5:27 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha could't do that

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

It's not true that Buddha cannot bestow an awakened mind.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean you disagree with the Buddha's own statement?

"One cannot wash away misdeeds with water, nor remove suffering with one's hand. I cannot give you my realization, but I can teach you the path."

Tsongkhapa said:

I don't disagree with it, but Buddha taught different things to different groups depending on their karma and in accordance with his skilful means. It is possible to receive realisations through the power of blessings and faith in Guru Yoga. It is a co-operative process, so Buddha is correct - he cannot bestow them unless the recipient is co-operating and has created all the causes. It's not something he talked about in Sutra.

Malcolm wrote:

Please present a statement from tantra where it says the Buddha can transfer his realization to another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2016 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

conebeckham said:

...grandiose egotism parading as Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Kim's grandiose egotism has definitely been on display...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2016 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Kim said:

OK. I think I've said enough.

Malcolm wrote:

Too much, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 30th, 2016 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Kim said:

For those people here who are against me...

Malcolm wrote:

Against you? Not a chance. Pity you and especially your followers? Absolutely.

Kim said:

I have criticised a lot of lamas and teachers but never (as) stoopidly (as here) and without basis.

Malcolm wrote:

You have provided ample basis for understanding you are a sad, deluded man.

BTW, folks, here is what Kim's 9th bhumi looks like:

```
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]
```

Honestly, I am amazed at the kind of schtick people on the internet will fall for.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 29th, 2016 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The dude is a crazy person. Best ignored.

Kim said:

I am not a buddhist teacher, nor are Open Heart teachings buddhist...I don't see the relevance of my work as a teacher and Open Heart on a buddhist forum

gzodzilpa said:

Seems a little misleading, since in 2015 you were explicitly claiming to be a Buddhist teacher. Furthermore, how is what you are doing not a gross instance of appropriation? You are explicitly and extensively using Buddhist jargon, from beginning to end, from the refuge to the practices to the "goal". You can't on one hand say you are teaching "Tibetan Heart Yoga", "guru yoga", "Machig Labdron guru mantra", and "ati yoga" and then on the other pretend that you aren't trying to teach Buddhism or at least give an impression to your students that you are teaching Buddhism. What makes your Heart Yoga "Tibetan"?

Gross appropriation especially seems to be the case when you are willfully redefining terms, like "bhumi" as it pertains to the stages of a bodhisattva, to suit this end. On one hand it helps one market as if there was some relationship with traditional Bhumis, while on the other hand allows one to shield yourself from criticism since you just

appeal to them being redefined. When you could of easily just used a completely different word altogether...It seems to me to be incredibly dishonest, this whole business of being "explicitly" non-Buddhist yet implicitly Buddhist.

Kim said:

For this reason I can teach what I have learned from my teachers, who have permitted me to do so.

gzodzilpa said:

Kim, at least some of the content you have gleaned from books and from having dialogue with Buddhist practitioners or hearing teachings from living Buddhist teachers. You ask questions under the guise of merely "verifying" what you "received" during meditation. More than one person has interacted with you and was left saddened by your insincerity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 29th, 2016 at 8:29 PM

Title: Re: Some towns in France ban burkinis

Content:

Wayfarer said:

So tolerance of dissenting views may be basic to Western liberalism, but it is alien to Islamic culture, generally.

Malcolm wrote:

This proves how very little you know of Islam, its history or its diversity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 29th, 2016 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: Some towns in France ban burkinis

Content:

boda said:

For example, in the United States nudity is illegal

Malcolm wrote:

Not everywhere. For example, in the state of Vermont there is no anti-nudity law. In Brattleboro VT., one can be naked anywhere within city limits apart from two sidewalks on one block in the center of town, and near churches and schools.

<http://www.sevendaysvt.com/vermont/wtf-why-is-public-nudity-legal-in-vermont-but-public-disrobing-isnt/Content?oid=2804753>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 29th, 2016 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

maybay said:

Come on guys didn't you ever think u might have been on the bhumis? Its the sign of his efforts in meditation exceeding his experience. For what its worth, I thought at one point I must have been an Arhat, and I've still not read anything since to conclusively disprove that.

Malcolm wrote:

You post here, and that is sufficient to disprove it.

maybay said:

Posting here proves nothing.

Malcolm wrote:

It proves you are not even a stream entrant, much less an arhat. However, I am sure if you sign up for our friend Kim's bhumi mapping, he will sort you out for a small donation.

<http://www.en.openheart.fi/97>

He says:

If you are familiar with the Open Heart Bhumi Model, you may wish to get your bhumi mapped, if you are not sure about it yourself. You are welcome to send your photo (face and eyes clearly seems as in a passport photo) to Kim for bhumi analysis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 29th, 2016 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

maybay said:

Come on guys didn't you ever think u might have been on the bhumis? Its the sign of his efforts in meditation exceeding his experience. For what its worth, I thought at one point I must have been an Arhat, and I've still not read anything since to conclusively disprove that.

Malcolm wrote:

You post here, and that is sufficient to disprove it.

And, Maybay, once you hit the bhumis, then you don't leave them. The question is only, how long does it take you to reach the stage of irreversibility [eighth bhumi] and cease taking rebirth in the desire realm?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 29th, 2016 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Malcolm, once again you hit the nail on the head. I wonder how no one here seems to question, investigate and criticise what this man says. Based on your many posts and private messages with you, it seems like you can say anything and get away with it, without nobody making questions. Honestly, I think that you subtly manipulate discussions and push what you want to say. Doesn't anyone question this man or are his credentials too great to do that?

Wow, you really haven't paid much attention here..people argue with Malcolm all the time, I've done so myself. Malcolm can be abrasive for sure, but I've rarely seen him pull the "shut up I'm a teacher" thing.

Malcolm wrote:

You've never seen me do that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 29th, 2016 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

monktastic said:

Kim, on page one you say that a lecture by Alan Wallace (given Jun 2016) caused something to click for you re: recognizing rigpa. Doesn't that seem incommensurate with being a 9th bhumi bodhisattva?

Malcolm wrote:

Really, you are much too nice of a person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 29th, 2016 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Norwegian said:

It's pretty sad.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, we live in a day full of self-deluded people, reincarnations of samaya breakers, who, with an internet connection, a facebook account, a blog, and a website, can easily set themselves up as gurus and spread their delusion around without any impediment.

If anyone doubted why restrictions on Dzogchen teachings have been imposed by Vajradhara, episodes such as this one should prove instructive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 29th, 2016 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

it's hard to know what to make of a character like that. On the one hand, its hard to believe anyone short of a schizophrenic could actually believe that they were a 9th bhumi bodhisattva who has received teachings from Padmasambhava and Garab Dorje. But the other alternative is that he's a con man who is perfectly aware of the scam he is trying to pull. or maybe those dharmapalas he pissed off really fuked him up more than he realizes.

Malcolm wrote:

Provocations, anyone?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 29th, 2016 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2016 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Kim said:

As I said I am just a student of buddhadharma, not a teacher of the tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

You are certainly acting like a teacher:

```
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 here:

<http://www.en.openheart.fi/33>

So I think your statement above is completely dishonest.

gad rgyangs said:

wow! at the bottom of his bio there is a link to a list of his teachers. under "teachers without a physical body" he claims hes received teachings directly from both Padmasambhava and Garab Dorje!

Malcolm 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: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2016 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Kim said:

As I said I am just a student of buddhadharma, not a teacher of the tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

You are certainly acting like a teacher:

```
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 here:

<http://www.en.openheart.fi/33>

So I think your statement above is completely dishonest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2016 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Kim said:

How will it harm anyone to speak openly about practical instructions and view for

recognising rigpa?

malcolm said:

It will harm one's samaya and will create an obstacle for those people who have not entered the teachings in a proper way to enter the teachings at all.

Kim said:

Bullcrap. "Create an obstacle"? How religious one has to be to believe this stuff!? Seriously.

Malcolm wrote:

As far as this goes, I will remind you of your own words, on another forum:

The moment I got the book on secret dzogchen practices by Namkhai Norbu and started reading it, I was attacked by very aggressive and violent subtle entities. At first I couldn't figure out what was happening. I was under a very violent attack on three consecutive days, until I figured out that these entities were the dharma protectors (dharma palas) of this particular dzogchen tradition and rinpoche. These attacks were so violent that I couldn't see with my physical eyes properly and got bad headaches. My interpretation of what happened was that these beings, dharma palas went after me because they have been programmed to do so if anyone trespassed their territory. It was like being in the ring with a professional heavy weight boxer who is out to finish you and who doesn't stop until you're knocked out. It was very serious. When I figured what was going on I burned the book and instantly carried the ashes out. The attack stopped... which was great because I finally got to recuperate. It was like having to engage in mortal combat for three days, that serious. These "dharma protectors" had attacked me so hard that my vitality had gone very low.

<http://www.dharmaoverground.org/discussion/->

[/message_boards/message/5854797#_com_liferay_message_boards_web_portlet_MBPortlet_message_5854241](#)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2016 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

It's not true that Buddha cannot bestow an awakened mind.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean you disagree with the Buddha's own statement?

"One cannot wash away misdeeds with water, nor remove suffering with one's hand. I cannot give you my realization, but I can teach you the path."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2016 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha could't do that

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen teachings may only be openly shared and discussed with people who have received Dzogchen transmission in a proper way.

Kim said:

Fine. I disagree with all this secrecy.

Malcolm wrote:

It's your samaya, not mine. Personally, I find such an attitude disrespectful to the teachings themselves.

Kim said:

No, Guru Rinpoche never made such a prediction. What the Dzogchen tantras state is that Dzogchen was the first teaching at the beginning of this great eon, and will be the last to remain before this universe is destroyed.

You are wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

Wrong about the Guru Rinpoche quote? Maybe. I would want to see a reliably sourced citation.

Wrong about my statement, not a chance. It is clearly stated in the Single Son of the All the Buddhas tantra.

Kim said:

How will it harm anyone to speak openly about practical instructions and view for recognising rigpa?

It will harm one's samaya and will create an obstacle for those people who have not entered the teachings in a proper way to enter the teachings at all.

Bullcrap. "Create an obstacle"? How religious one has to be to believe this stuff!? Seriously.

Malcolm wrote:

Please make sure you tell any authentic teacher of Dzogchen from whom you are interested in receiving teachings that this is your attitude. There are guardians of the teachings who are responsible for punishing those who do not keep their samaya. Only a fool messes with this. As they say however, "Angels fear to tread..."

Kim said:

Rather, the discussion is on a superficial level.

Malcolm wrote:

Necessarily so. It is also good that this is so. But there are plenty of places on Facebook, for example, when people of rampant egotism boast about their paltry experience and blab about things of which they understand little. Perhaps you will find some like-minded people there.

Kim said:

I'm pretty sure that if I posted here instructions for doing this, it would not be allowed. Rightly so, such instructions are meant to be used by a qualified master in a live situation with students who have expressed sincere interest and devotion to the Dzogchen teachings.

Interest and devotion. Our true nature (rigpa) requires none of this. It doesn't and cannot accept followers or servants. A true master will accept none of this.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the approach of Jax and others like him.

Understanding Dzogchen requires the five faculties, just like any other teaching of the Buddha. What are the five? Faith, diligence, mindfulness, samadhi and wisdom.

Kim said:

What I am telling you is that apart from some western, self-appointed "Dzogchen" masters who imagine they can give direct introduction through email, no Dzogchen master worth their salt on the face of the planet thinks that it is sufficient to read some techniques derived from Dzogchen teachings and try to apply them without having been introduced to Dzogchen in a proper way. Of course, people will still chase after charlatans and fools, but there is little one can do to prevent that, apart from communicating the authentic requirements for entering Dzogchen teachings in a pure, guileless way.

I do not disagree with the fact that probably no one can recognise rigpa without a long committed practices, of various kinds. I recall two of my friends who are/have been very committed orthodox dzogchen-practitioners of well known and respected lineages. The other of them, who trained with his rinpoche for over 15 years, and received the highest empowerments in the tradition among other close circle students, while acknowledging the efficacy of some of it, said what many people out there say, that mostly people are seduced with foreign terms of "dzogchen" or "rigpa" but what they taught are boring lectures of emptiness and compassion that do not really explain what is talked about. Lamas are setting the carrots of "dzogchen" on front of donkeys and they start running, someday somehow hoping to be granted "dzogchen" whatever they understand it to be. Nobody explains this stuff to them, except after 12 years of a lot of doing this and that, to a small group of chosen students. This happened to my friend. He felt he'd been conned, while saying that a small part of all that he was taught during 15 years was actually of practical use. And he got the highest teachings after catching direct introduction. I've heard many such stories, also from vajrayana. So tell me, who is a fool and a charlatan? There is no transparency in orthodox dzogchen. This allows a lot of unhealthiness.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, if you are interested in Dzogchen teachings, you need to meet an authentic master of Dzogchen. There have never been more than a few in any generation, and they are dwindling.

That said, your friend gathered the two accumulations for fifteen years. This is not insignificant, and is a necessary prerequisite to any teaching belonging to Secret Mantra. It is not like his store of merit took a nose dive.

For example, Vimalamitra notes in his commentary on the root tantra of Dzogchen, the Realms and Transformations of Sound:

Prior to those preliminaries, those sublime persons did various methods of gathering accumulations.

It is very important for any Dzogchen practitioners to engage constantly in the practice of purification and accumulation.

As to some unscrupulous teachers using the name Dzogchen to attract students in the manner of setting out beef but selling dog meat, these kinds of teachers will meet their own unsavory ends.

We just need to keep reminding people to search out and follow authentic masters of Dzogchen teachings, and not to settle for anything less. If you study with someone who advertises themselves as a teacher of Dzogchen, but they never teach Dzogchen, there is no chain binding you to that teacher.

It is not the case that there is a "traditional" way of presenting Dzogchen, as opposed to a modern way. There is only one way, and that is the way Dzogchen has been promulgated in this world since the time of Garab Dorje.

Kim said:

I don't have a problem holding the teachings in high regard. "But they are the property of the whole human kind.

Malcolm wrote:

No, in fact they are the property, if you want to put it that way, of the guardians of the teachings, to whom the teachings were entrusted for care and safekeeping on behalf of those of us in this degenerate era who have the karmic good fortune to meet them and be devoted to them.

Not all human beings are interested in Dzogchen just as not all human beings have a precious human birth.

Even if you explained every detail of Dzogchen teachings to them they would be like, "What the hell, I don't believe in rainbow bodies, reincarnation, etc." If you don't accept rebirth, as in every other teaching of the Buddha, you won't be able to attain liberation

through Dzogchen teachings in this lifetime, the bardo or in the next life — although, as my teacher said about such people, "Maybe they can relax a little bit."

Most people are not Buddhists. Among Buddhists, very few are interested in Secret Mantra teachings, as is well illustrated by this board. Of those who are interested in Secret Mantra teachings, very few of them are interested in Dzogchen teachings. Of those people who are interested in Dzogchen teachings, very few are really that interested in practicing and studying them more than superficially. There are even fewer people, such as translators like myself, who spend the majority of their time studying and practicing these teachings.

Dzogchen teachings are rare, not because they are kept away under lock and key, Dzogchen teachings are rare because very few people have the karmic disposition and fortune to receive them. That said, anyone who is truly interested in Dzogchen teachings can go out and find a qualified teacher. One can even tune into a webcast and receive them from a qualified master for free, like right now, this week.

Kim said:

All that talk about samaya and creating obstacles. Gimme a break. That's the real tragedy.

Malcolm wrote:

Understanding that samaya must be followed and that obstacles arise from not following samaya is an integral part of Dzogchen teachings, as it is in all Secret Mantra. Its not optional — well it is, in the sense that if someone chooses not to follow samaya, no human being has the power to do anything about it. But the *dākinīs* swiftly punish those who think samaya is of no consequence at all, especially when it comes to Dzogchen teachings. Understanding the importance of samaya is foundational in Dzogchen. This is why many chapters are devoted to explaining what samayas are, both relatively and ultimately, and why it is necessary to observe them. It is not a hardship.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2016 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: How to believe in rebirth

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You have to ask yourself where your mind comes from. If you think it is a product of the brain, well, there is no way to really convince someone that this is not true.

boda said:

You don't think it's possible to understand the evolution of a human mind, with it's biological and environmental dependencies? Who do you hangout with?

Malcolm wrote:

That's one narrative. There are others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2016 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha could't do that

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I guess we're all screwed.

Malcolm wrote:

Speak for yourself.

dzogchungpa said:

Jeez dude, lighten up.

Malcolm wrote:

Tell us your real name, then I will lighten up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2016 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: Mañjuśrī Sādhana

Content:

paël said:

Can anyone recite Manjusrinamasamgiti? Does it need empowerment/transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

It requires a lung.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 28th, 2016 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha could't do that

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A student to whom Dzogchen should not be taught, is as follows:

... engaged in pointless activities ...

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I guess we're all screwed.

Malcolm wrote:
Speak for yourself.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2016 at 11:50 PM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that
Content:

Kim said:
Mystification. I feel it is mystification when things are not pragmatically explained open. I feel that the opinion that dzogchen-pointers for practice couldn't or shouldn't be talked about on internet boards is so 90's (and pre-90's). But hey, everyone is free to think whatever.

Malcolm wrote:
Dzogchen teachings may only be openly shared and discussed with people who have received Dzogchen transmission in a proper way.

Kim said:
Guru Rinpoche made a prediction that goes something along the lines that at some point the lower vehicles of buddhism will lose their popularity and atiyoga (dzogchen) will gain popularity. I don't think it will ever happen with this pre-90's style of sharing, whether online or in person.

Malcolm wrote:
No, Guru Rinpoche never made such a prediction. What the Dzogchen tantras state is that Dzogchen was the first teaching at the beginning of this great eon, and will be the last to remain before this universe is destroyed.

Kim said:
How will it harm anyone to speak openly about practical instructions and view for recognising rigpa?

Malcolm wrote:
It will harm one's samaya and will create an obstacle for those people who have not entered the teachings in a proper way to enter the teachings at all.

Kim said:
Well. How much discussion and (lack of) practical pointers here have helped you (or others) in recognising rigpa?

Malcolm wrote:
One cannot recognize the basis without a qualified master to introduce it to one.

Kim said:

I'm pretty sure that if I posted here instructions for doing this, it would not be allowed.

Malcolm wrote:

Rightly so, such instructions are meant to be used by a qualified master in a live situation with students who have expressed sincere interest and devotion to the Dzogchen teachings.

Kim said:

I'm just riffing here, being honest. I am not saying that I am a "dzogchen teacher". I am not but I simply don't think instructions, using different types of techniques, couldn't be shared here for the benefit of many.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is not a technique.

Kim said:

"Recognising rigpa" was an intended choice of words I made. I didn't meant anything malicious or negative with this but I admit I did use these words to see if you'd get caught in them. I am sorry if this hurts anyones feelings here but I did this just to point out Malcolm's way of communication. It's just negation, "It's not like that". Then I'd be in a situation with a authorised dzogchen lama to ask, "How it is then? Could you clarify?", to which he'd say a difficult phrase in Tibetan or "These things are not discussed online" or "Find a lama and ask him".

Malcolm wrote:

What I am telling you is that apart from some western, self-appointed "Dzogchen" masters who imagine they can give direct introduction through email, no Dzogchen master worth their salt on the face of the planet thinks that it is sufficient to read some techniques derived from Dzogchen teachings and try to apply them without having been introduced to Dzogchen in a proper way. Of course, people will still chase after charlatans and fools, but there is little one can do to prevent that, apart from communicating the authentic requirements for entering Dzogchen teachings in a pure, guileless way.

Kim said:

I certainly am not saying that how things are said in Tibetan are worthless. Of course not. It's just that clearly discussion here is getting caught on things that are practically not that important.

Malcolm wrote:

Receiving Dzogchen teachings in the proper way, i.e., through receiving empowerments, reading transmissions and guidance on those from a qualified master is the most important point of all, one that I share over and over again, and will continue to share for as long as breath does not leave my body. It is the most helpful observation one can make. Why? Because I have received the three series of Dzogchen teachings from four notable masters, one whom is still with us [ChNN], and I think they are the most

precious and valuable possession of knowledge that humans beings possess and will ever possess. Therefore, I regard it as a tragic pity when people are impatient and do not take the time and effort to seek out the guidance of an authentic master, or worse, think that the tried and true method of promulgating Dzogchen teachings is, in your words, "medieval thinking."

The consequences of not entering Dzogchen teachings in the proper way are described in Dzogchen tantras as follows. The Self-Arisen Vidyā Tantra states:

The faults of not obtaining the empowerment are as follows: in the bardo one is alarmed, panicked, exhausted, impeded, and one can also lose consciousness.

While one has not yet left the body of traces, migrating beings will not see one as worthy of respect. One's merit will be small, one's life short, one's enjoyments of living will be few, one will be powerless, and many obstacles will occur. Nothing will be accomplished. Those are the faults of not obtaining the empowerment for the conduct of Secret Mantra. A yogin of Secret Mantra conduct must first obtain empowerment. If empowerment is not obtained, not even the Buddha will be able to turn the wheel on the stage of a tathāgata. If the wheel cannot be turned, then the nirmanakāya will not be able to benefit migrating beings with compassion. Therefore the empowerment of the conduct of Secret Mantra must be obtained.

It continues by warning of the faults of not maintaining samaya, which is at the root of this discussion:

These are the warning signs of broken samaya:

various misfortunes arise,
diseases are rampant and harmful,
various contagious diseases occur,
and there are also provocations and misguiders.

If one is killed, one becomes a hell being.

One's eyes cannot see form.

One cannot hear and one's work cannot be done.

Leprosy and blistering diseases arise.

Thieves and royal punishments occur.

One contracts contagious diseases others do not get.

One's sons and daughters die.

The whole country arises as one's enemy.

One's activities become completely pointless.

Thus, this is why we should not be discussing Dzogchen teachings in any specific way online, apart from encouraging people to find qualified Dzogchen masters under which they may study and practice.

On the fault of not receiving empowerment, the Mind Mirror of Vajrasattva Tantra states:

The demonstration of the fault of not obtaining the supreme empowerment is that the yogin, for example, will be like a boatman without an oar, unable to deliver [his passengers] to the other side. If the supreme empowerment is obtained, the secret mantra that is not accomplished will be accomplished. How will secret mantra be accomplished without relying on empowerment?

It continues by describing the unqualified master:

If the master is not authentic, his scriptures are like a monkey's. One will enter a false path, and one will practice corrupted Secret Mantra. Since he is a misguider, he should be avoided.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2016 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: how do things end?

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

"Reality" is such a singularly strange abstract noun...

Malcolm wrote:

In fact it means the "the state of being [ity] pertaining to [a] things [res]."

treehuggingoctopus said:

Saying "the state of being pertaining to things" is just as singularly strange

What the hell is "being"?

(And what are "things"?)

Malcolm wrote:

And what is "pertaining to."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2016 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: First meeting with guru

Content:

makewhisper said:

Any advice for how to best approach that first meeting? Is it appropriate to ask about receiving specific practices, like a ngondro or a set of prayers or a meditation practice?

In gratitude,

Eric

Malcolm wrote:

Until you have received a major empowerment, you do not have a guru. So relax, check out many teachers, then finally decide which one works for you and work with that person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2016 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen for beginners

Content:

Coëmgenu said:

If you could describe Dzogchen, from your perspective, and/or from others', in one forum post, how would you? (To someone who knows nothing about Dzogchen or Vajrayana/Tantrayana).

What links would you link said learner to? What resources would you suggest for them, in what way would you advocate, for them, the path that is described, in contemporary tongue, as "Dzogchen"?

Malcolm wrote:

You as well try to describe sight to the blind.

Find a proper Dzogchen master, then follow their instructions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2016 at 7:27 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Kim said:

I think this is misleading. What you are saying is that some westerners or non-Tibetan knowing people can practice dzogchen, i.e. their recognition of rigpa is comprehensive enough and yet if they don't know Tibetan language they really can't teach it. This doesn't make any sense. Obviously knowing the original language is part of the equation but to go as far to say that one couldn't get people recognise rigpa, it is not reasonable statement.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no term in Tibetan, "recognize rigpa." Putting it in these terms is a huge fail. This misunderstanding exists because many people, translators included, think rig pa = awareness. Let me assure you, it does not.

Kim said:

As a general remark, I'm starting to feel that dzogchen is a bit mystified here at DW. On the other hand it seems that discussion on this forum isn't aimed at clarifying things, such as rigpa-practice, in a way that would help the participants and readers in their own practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is not mystified on this forum, at all.

Much of the discussion of Dzogchen on this forum concerns the elimination of errors of interpretation such as the one I refer to above. Honestly, Dzogchen, Lamdre,

Mahāmudra, etc., should not be discussed on forums such as these at all. To the extent that Dzogchen is the least understood, but the most "popular" and "fashionable" teaching right now, because people have this mistaken notion that it is easy to understand, to that extent I discuss some issues and that is all. But practitioners of these teachings should not really be looking to internet boards for help. It is fine, as happens often enough, people are isolated and need references to information for this or that thing. But this is not a place for giving teachings or helping people with their "Dzogchen" practice. That is what a guru and vajra siblings are for.

So, if someone should want help with their practice, find a proper teacher of Dzogchen, follow the latter's instructions, and stop whinging about Tibetan culture, etc.

A proper student has the following qualities:

With strong faith and great diligence,
great intelligence and without attachments,
highly respectful, engaging in Secret Mantra conduct,
without concepts, without mental distractions,
possessing samaya, diligent in practice,
mindful and constant, diligent in practice,
engaging in meditation which is clear and vivid,
doing whatever the master says,
not permitting indifference towards samaya,
engaging in conduct that accords with others,
steadfastly respectful,
following a single phrase when indicated,
moreover, engaged in his own benefit,
capable of keeping secrets,
never leaving the meaning of the vajra,
giving explanations to those of great learning,
never going beyond his personal benefit, [19/a]
without harsh words, soft-spoken,
in accord with the minds of others,
regarding the master and the tathāgatas
as being identical —
those are the qualities of a disciple.

Such a disciple

is said to be the proper vessel of the Great Perfection.

The meaning of the Great Perfection's intimate instructions
cannot be poured into a common, inferior vessel.

If the faithful pour a little of that juice
into an inferior vessel,
the juice is lost and both are ruined.

Therefore it must be kept secret from those who are not suitable vessels.

A student to whom Dzogchen should not be taught, is as follows:

Not making offerings or paying respect,
practicing Secret Mantra incorrectly,

without a good family, insincere,
unintelligent,
ignoring kindness,
boasting of his own family,
wearing ornaments on his body,
and engaged in pointless activities —
the unexamined disciple is the enemy of the master.
Do not explain the meaning of the Great Perfection
to those who will not practice it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2016 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha could't do that

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Yeah, I get this. Practicing a thing well and teaching it well are two very separate things. To teach something you have to know enough of the underlying architecture of the teaching to do that, which is completely different than just explaining your own practice.

Truthfully, there is a lot of Western Buddhist 'teaching' in the second category - someone just explaining their own experiences and opinions, it has it's value, but whether it constitutes actual Dharma teaching or something else is kind of debatable.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, when we are teaching we have to take into consideration the capacity of the student. We have to know how to address their needs, what they need to be taught. Frankly, understanding Dzogchen is not this simple idea of "Recognize the nature of the mind, then you're a buddha." This latter idea is very stupid and dangerous. Dzogchen teachings are subtle and not so easy to understand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2016 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha could't do that

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Yes, because it is not clear if you are saying that it is necessary to know Tibetan to be even remotely qualified to transmit Dzogchen teachings at this time, or if there just does not happen to be, at this time, as far as you know, any people who don't know Tibetan and yet are so qualified.

Malcolm wrote:

At this particular juncture in time, it is necessary to be conversant in Tibetan in order to transmit Dzogchen teachings properly. However, you don't need to know much Tibetan, if any, to practice Dzogchen, etc. I have met a few westerners, illiterate in Tibetan, who I think have a very good understanding of Dzogchen. But I don't think they can teach it

because to be a teacher has a different set of requirements, beyond merely having a good understanding for one's own practice. All of the people I am talking about agree. YMMV.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2016 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Um, I was just asking if you knew if Lama Drimed or Yeshe Namkhai know Tibetan. Do you? I don't and I would like to know.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you should ask them yourself.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, I guess you're working on your vajra coyness.

Anyway, just to clarify your earlier statement, if I ask a teacher if he or she knows Tibetan and the answer is no then, according to you, I can safely conclude that they are not even remotely qualified to transmit Dzogchen teachings?

Malcolm wrote:

Was there something unclear about what I said?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2016 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

bump

Malcolm wrote:

There was something ambiguous about my statement? That said, I am not going to lead into commenting on specific persons.

dzogchungpa said:

Um, I was just asking if you knew if Lama Drimed or Yeshe Namkhai know Tibetan. Do you? I don't and I would like to know.

Malcolm wrote:
I think you should ask them yourself.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2016 at 1:08 AM
Title: Re: Rig Pai Ye shes
Content:
kalden yungdrung said:
Tashi delek DW members,

Rig-pa'i ye-shes - the knowledge which is immediate Awareness.

The above Dzogchen term is difficult to understand. Namely, the relation between knowledge and Awareness.

Mutsug Marro
KY.

Kim said:
Any term when they are not described from a living experience are difficult or impossible to understand.

Malcolm wrote:
This is what a master is for, to explain these terms from their experience of the teachings.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 27th, 2016 at 12:55 AM
Title: Re: Even the Buddha could't do that
Content:

dzogchungpa said:
bump

Malcolm wrote:
There was something ambiguous about my statement? That said, I am not going to led into commenting on specific persons.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, August 26th, 2016 at 7:50 PM
Title: Re: how do things end?
Content:
treehuggingoctopus said:

"Reality" is such a singularly strange abstract noun...

Malcolm wrote:

In fact it means the "the state of being [ity] pertaining to [al] things [res]."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2016 at 7:30 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha could't do that

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

I don't know what Tenzin Palmo was intending when she made her statement but it's utterly ridiculous to say that Buddha cannot liberate living beings from suffering because that's the whole point of attaining enlightenment. Buddha showed many times during his life that he possessed all the skilful means to liberate others.

Malcolm wrote:

What she was referring to is the Buddha's statement that misdeeds cannot be washed away with water, suffering cannot be removed with the hand, that he cannot bestow liberation, but that he can teach a path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2016 at 7:30 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha could't do that

Content:

Kim said:

No, she wasn't.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually that is exactly what she was saying. She was point out that it is our responsibility to follow a path. There is no collective method of waking up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2016 at 5:47 AM

Title: Re: Sitting next to a buddha and not knowing it

Content:

Kim said:

If a high lama or a living buddha was clad in normal clothes, sitting in a bus among other people, would anyone notice that there is buddha onboard?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2016 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha could't do that

Content:

Kim said:

You said above that "Dzogchen... are a very precise method of communicating a very specific kind of knowledge (rig pa)". What is it that makes this so amazingly and unique? What is so special?

Malcolm wrote:

If you understand Dzogchen teachings properly, you will never take rebirth in samsara again, guaranteed.

Kim said:

Right. So you were referring to trekcho, attainment of buddhahood. Or does this option become erased earlier on on the path of dzogchen? At some bodhisattva stage perhaps?

krodha said:

Kim, perhaps try splitting your responses up into multiple posts.

Kim said:

I would but it's not possible to edit one's posts here...

Malcolm wrote:

No, I was not referring Trekcho specifically.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2016 at 3:52 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha could't do that

Content:

Kim said:

You said above that "Dzogchen... are a very precise method of communicating a very specific kind of knowledge (rig pa)". What is it that makes this so amazingly and unique? What is so special?

Malcolm wrote:

If you understand Dzogchen teachings properly, you will never take rebirth in samsara again, guaranteed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2016 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest

Content:

MiphamFan said:

Does Samkhya yoga actually have channels, cakras in addition to asanas? I thought it was Shaivite thing?

Malcolm wrote:

Samkhya is one thing, Yoga another. Samkhya itself is pretty much intellectual. Yoga shares its view, but emphasizes the development of samadhi, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2016 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't omniscience is a particular issues for Samkhya/yoga, since everything apart from puruṣa is just transformations of prakriti.

Losal Samten said:

What about in Saiva Trika?

Malcolm wrote:

No clue. Look in Lakshmani Joo's books.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2016 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think so, since Samkhya adherents consider the Advaita view incorrect.

Losal Samten said:

In Advaita, omniscience is reserved for Isvara alone and not the yogin; is the same true in Trika?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't omniscience is a particular issues for Samkhya/yoga, since everything apart from puruṣa is just transformations of prakriti.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2016 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Then of course there is the guardians of the teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 26th, 2016 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha could't do that

Content:

Soma999 said:

I don't know Keith Downman, but trying to say "he is not a lama, who authorised him and so forth" can be a convenient way not to listen to him by saying he has no autorisation to speak and teach, even though we have not the slightest idea of his realisation and his inner life and integrity (it's not written on a diploma). This may be a strategy for avoiding to listen to a point of view which may make feel you uncomfortable - even though he may bring something of value : his own experience (which may not be adapted to everyone, of course).

Everyone is different, what works for someone may not work for another. I feel it's good to listen to people who do not necesserally share the same point of view, it helps to grow.

If we just want to stay with people who thinks exactly the same, it's comfortable, but maybe not very enlightening.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen teachings are something very precise and specific. When someone is sufficiently educated in these teachings, then they can understand very well who is and who isn't a qualified person to give teachings on them. That said, this is neither a condemnation of Dowman nor an endorsement. I do not know him personally, and I am neutral as far as this goes. I will just reinforce the point that it is very important how one chooses from whom to learn Dzogchen teachings. It is much more critical, than for example, from whom one learns Lam Rim, Mind Training, etc., or even from whom one might receive pratimokśa or bodhisattva vows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2016 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha could't do that

Content:

Kim said:

I have met and talked with many people who got fed up with the highly religious system of Tibetan buddhism taught by respected lamas. They expected to receive understandable instructions to illuminate their minds but this didn't happen. What they got were religious rituals and forms glad in Tibetan attire. "Do this for 500 k and you'll know", they were told. A pig in a poke.

Malcolm wrote:

People are lazy, and expect instant results.

People do not want to commit.

People expect liberation in a pill.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2016 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha could't do that

Content:

Kim said:

Dzogchen view-wise I haven't spotted any mistakes there. What he seems to do in his teaching session is to avoid any Tibetan or Sanskrit terms. That's wonderful.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you quite sure you understand the meaning of Dzogchen? For example, do you understand clearly the distinction between the basis and the all-basis?

Kim said:

That can happen without any thangkas, Tibetan language or any of that external pomp.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen tantras and teachings are a very precise method of communicating a very specific kind of knowledge (rig pa). The transmission of Dzogchen is in its infancy at this point. There isn't single person who is not conversant with Tibetan language that I would consider even remotely qualified to transmit Dzogchen teachings. Further, Dzogchen is very much bound up with Vajrayāna in general. People who do not understand Vajrayāna at all have no hope of really understanding the point of Dzogchen.

I don't know about the realization of any Westerner, or for that matter, any Tibetan teacher under 60, all tulkus included. But I do know about the realization of my guru, ChNN; my late guru, Kunzang Dechen Lingpa; as well as the realization of the late Khenpo Jigme Phuntsok, another of my gurus; and the realization of the late HH Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche, yet another of my gurus. All four of these people are realized Dzogchen masters.

If you are going to study Dzogchen, it is better to find a person whom you feel has realized the meaning of those teachings. Such a person's qualifications are stated in the Dzogchen tantras as follows:

The master of the intimate instructions that possesses the vajra meaning
has a positive attitude, is skillful in teaching,
has obtained the empowerments, applies the meaning of Secret Mantra,
understands all the inner and outer activities,
is inseparable from the meditation deity,
remains undistracted in samadhi,
is knowledgeable in the secret tantras of Secret Mantra,
possesses the meaning of the intimate instructions of the Great Perfection,

engages in all outer and inner sadhanas, [18b]
never leaves the meaning of the view,
gives up outer, inner, and secret activities,
is endowed with qualities like a precious jewel,
and enjoys an inexhaustible treasury.
With the cord of compassion unsevered
and the stream of affection uninterrupted,
the master and disciple are thus connected.
Such a master of the intimate instructions
should be served with one's body, precious substances,
and very rare items.
A master to avoid is described as follows:
A master lacking a connection with a lineage of scholars,
who is self-important,
stupid, literal-minded,
who does not understand the meaning of Secret Mantra,
has harsh words for others, is boastful,
has entered false paths, has not seen the mandala of the empowerment, disregards
samaya, [18/a]
is unable to answer questions,
has little learning, and great pride —
such an unexamined master is a māra for the disciple.
He is not a master who can teach Secret Mantra
and is unable to teach the Great Perfection, Ati.
Do not associate with such a person.
As always, with any teacher, caveat emptor.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2016 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Even the Buddha couldn't do that

Content:

Kim said:

He [Dowman] says that he is among those who have "gone through that whole circuit of oriental culture and Tibetan buddhism". So I suppose he has a solid vajrayana history. And yet he is of the opinion that all that is not needed.

Malcolm wrote:

It really depends on the student.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2016 at 10:32 PM

Title: Re: Monism, Eternalism, etc

Content:

boda said:

I simply don't require this sort of religious narrative.

Malcolm wrote:
Well, bully for you!

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2016 at 10:31 PM
Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
Ramaswami taught on the Yoga Sūtras, and differentiated it's view from Advaita very clearly

Losal Samten said:
Do you know what the Yogis' take on Advaita is in general? Whilst different in terms of universal purusha, illusory prakriti etc., do they think Advaitans still attain liberation, or do they see them as thieving piss-takers?

Malcolm wrote:
I don't think so, since Saṃkhya adherents consider the Advaita view incorrect.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2016 at 10:06 PM
Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
In the Yoga Sūtras, Íśvara is a special type of puruśa, a being who never experienced the tattvas. But Íśvara is not a godhead nor is it creative, per se. While it is indeed said that through devotion to Íśvara one can obtain mukti, mukti still means turning away from prakriti. Not only this, but in the Saṃkhya/Yoga view there are infinite puruśas, of which Íśvara is but one. Thus did my teacher of Yoga, Śrīvasta Ramaswami, teach.

DGA said:
If so, then it seems to me that some contemporary / modern yogic writers, such as Aurobindo Ghose, take a different tack from the yoga sutras. So it goes.

Malcolm wrote:
There is also an Advaita spin, based on Shankara's commentary. But the original Yoga Sūtras are fully Saṃkhya in nature and do not go beyond that view. During our yoga course, six weeks, Ramaswami taught on the Yoga Sūtras, and differentiated it's view from Advaita very clearly. Ramaswami is one of the last remaining direct pupil of Krishnamācārya, and the only person to whom the latter taught his entire system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2016 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest

Content:

maybay said:

Realization may also come if one is oriented toward the ideal of pure awareness, Isvara.

Isvara is a distinct, incorruptible form of pure awareness, utterly independent of cause and effect, and lacking any store of latent impressions.

Its independence makes this awareness an incomparable source of omniscience.

Existing beyond time, Isvara was also the ideal of the ancients.

<https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ishvara>

Malcolm wrote:

In the Yoga Sūtras, Íśvara is a special type of puruśa, a being who never experienced the tattvas. But Íśvara is not a godhead nor is it creative, per se. While it is indeed said that through devotion to Íśvara one can obtain mukti, mukti still means turning away from prakriti. Not only this, but in the Saṃkhya/Yoga view there are infinite puruśas, of which Íśvara is but one. Thus did my teacher of Yoga, Śrīvasta Ramaswami, teach.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2016 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.

Content:

boda said:

So you're talking about emptiness. Why didn't you just say so? Anyway, emptiness is only one aspect of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

Did I use the word emptiness anywhere?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2016 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar khyentse... monk?

Content:

Sonam Wangchug said:

Older lama's refer to Khyentse rinpoche as "Yangsi rinpoche" Such as Orgyen tobgyal rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, for people who do not know, " yang srid " (punarbhāva) literally means "reincarnation" or "rebirth." In this case, the reincarnation of Dzongsar Khyentse II, Chökyi Lödo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2016 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: DJK on tulkus

Content:

Malcolm 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]
```

dzogchungpa said:

Now you're being ridiculous.

Malcolm wrote:

What? You mean you don't think this is a wry comment on the subject matters of tulkus?

Perhaps the lyrics will refresh you:

Fame, makes a man take things over

Fame, lets him loose, hard to swallow

Fame, puts you there where things are hollow

Fame

Fame, it's not your brain, it's just the flame

That burns your change to keep you insane

Fame

Fame, what you like is in the limo

Fame, what you get is no tomorrow

Fame, what you need you have to borrow

Fame

Fame, "Nein! It's mine!" is just his line

To bind your time, it drives you to, crime

Fame

Could it be the best, could it be?

Really be, really, babe?

Could it be, my babe, could it, babe?

Really, really?

Is it any wonder I reject you first?

Fame, fame, fame, fame

Is it any wonder you are too cool to fool

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2016 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest

Content:

DGA said:

What makes yoga as a knowledge unique is its objective, union with one or another terms for Absolute Godhead.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on the yoga tradition. This is certainly not the goal of the Yoga Sūtras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2016 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Yuren said:

I'm really surprised to see there are so many Trump supporters on a forum like this!

Malcolm wrote:

Some people have no common sense at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 25th, 2016 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: DJK on tulkus

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

```
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]
```

Malcolm 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: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: What are the requirements to be "lineage holders"?

Content:

Adamantine said:

Any thoughts on what terms may be translated as lineage-holder? And why there may be varying interpretations? (I.e. are different Tibetan terms being translated as the same term in English?)

In gTerma traditions, there is usually someone prophesied as carrying on and maintaining the gTerma lineage after the tertön has passed on. Is there a specific term for that?

Malcolm wrote:

lineage holder = brgyud 'dzin

holder of the teachings = bstan 'dzin

lord/owner of the treasure = gter bdag

Adamantine said:

Thank you. Can you please define each of these in English the best that you can? Do brgyud 'dzin and bstan 'dzin have significantly different meanings for example?

When you stated in this thread

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=49&t=5037&start=20#top> that

Malcolm wrote:

Shenphen Rinpoche, who is one of my important masters, is indeed the primary lineage holder of Dudjom Tersar, and the keeper of Dudjom Rinpoche's seat in North America where Dudjom Rinpoche concealed many precious teachings.

Adamantine said:

what did you mean by "primary lineage holder"? Brgyud 'dzin, bstan 'dzin, or gter bdag? What is the Tibetan term translated as "regent"? One of these?

Sorry just would like to know what misunderstandings may have arisen from translation issues.

Malcolm wrote:

regent is rgyal tshab.

Here, I mean gdung sras, literally, "heir (sras) of the family lineage (gdung)." I guess he can be considered the interregnum gter bdag, but since there are two incarnations, I will let them hash it out between them. Since he is the keeper of Dudjom Rinpoche's seat (gdan sa) in NA, he could also be called a " bdag chen."

bstan 'dzin (sasanadhara) is usually reserved for monks. It means someone who holds the tripitika, in general.

brgyud 'dzin means someone who holds this or that lineage (brgyud, paramparā).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: What are the requirements to be "lineage holders"?

Content:

Adamantine said:

Any thoughts on what terms may be translated as lineage-holder? And why there may be varying interpretations? (I.e. are different Tibetan terms being translated as the same term in English?)

In gTerma traditions, there is usually someone prophesied as carrying on and maintaining the gTerma lineage after the tertön has passed on. Is there a specific term for that?

Malcolm wrote:

lineage holder = brgyud 'dzin

holder of the teachings = bstan 'dzin

lord/owner of the treasure = gter bdag

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: DJK on tulkus

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

My bad, should be quote marks.

dzogchungpa said:

We agree on something, at last.

Malcolm wrote:

Don't worry, I will find a way out of it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: What are the requirements to be "lineage holders"?

Content:

Adamantine said:

Hmmmmnnnn.... I haven't interpreted the term "lineage holder" as meaning anyone who happens to have permission to teach, or even anyone with the title "Lama", and so on. I have interpreted it to mean a great master, usually someone people refer to as "precious one" / Rinpoche, who has been given a mandate by the previous lineage holder, or tertön, to oversee and work towards the preservation, continuation,

maintenance and expansion of the lineage without any errors, misconduct, or degeneration of the purity of the essential transmissions. Foremost concern would be the pure samaya of the lineage holder, so that all transmissions are authentic and complete. Sometimes the lineage holder would have been given permission to alter or adjust aspects of the practices or revelations according to their own wisdom mind, responding to circumstances or need. Sometimes more than one can function as a lineage holder of the same tradition. . . Anyway, that's been my interpretation of the term. I can see that someone with permission and/or the realization and ability to give proper abisheka/wang/Vajrayana empowerment could be interpreted as functioning as a lineage holder, but I don't usually see the term commonly used that broader way. I don't know what the original Tibetan term would be that is sometimes translated as lineage holder—correctly or incorrectly—or if there are multiple terms that are translated this way—correctly or incorrectly. And I don't know if my interpretation (based on what I've gleaned from others' interpretation) is in fact correct. So I am happy to hear from anyone with more knowledge and who is familiar with Tibetan.

Malcolm wrote:

According to ChNN, everyone who has received the teachings is a "lineage holder." This does not mean they can teach, however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: DJK on tulkus

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The period should go inside of closing paranthesis, like this: "The tulku system and the people in it are currently demonstrating the 'suffering of change.'"

You should also lose the commas, as above, otherwise, it should be like this "The tulku system is currently demonstrating the 'suffering of change,' as well as the people in it."

smcj said:

Thanks Malcolm. I like the second rewrite better.

dzogchungpa said:

Those aren't parentheses, are they? Whatever they are, I don't think they are necessary. My version: The tulku system is currently demonstrating the suffering of change, as are its constituents.

Malcolm wrote:

My bad, should be quote marks.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 10:45 PM
Title: Re: DJK on tulkus
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
We agree on something, at last.

Adamantine said:
Yet another example of impermanence.

Malcolm wrote:
Indeed, since it will not last long, probably not the hour.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 10:26 PM
Title: Re: DJK on tulkus
Content:
maybay said:
The tulku system is sick. The tulku system is degenerate / degenerating.

Malcolm wrote:
We agree on something, at last.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 10:18 PM
Title: Re: DJK on tulkus
Content:
maybay said:
What you seem to want to say is that everything about the tulku system, from the ABC to the xyz, is a lesson in the 'suffering of change'.

smcj said:
I thought it awkward to say that a system was suffering rather than saying people were suffering. But yes, that was my point.

Malcolm wrote:
We can also say systems are suffering.

In fact, your favorite book, the Uttaratantra, states quite clearly that the Dharma is not a true refuge, and neither is the Sangha, because they are impermanent and compounded entities. Only the dharmakāya of the Buddha is a true refuge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: DJK on tulkus

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on the plural or singular tense. Enclosing all punctuation inside of the closing parenthesis is hard to get used to, but it is indeed the standard approach now in academic and professional writing. I hate the editing process, and as a translator publishing books, dealing with different editors and different style sheets can be a hassle. The 84000 project has a very solid style sheet. It is worth looking at.

Losal Samten said:

Do you mean in academic and professional American writing? Using punctuation inside of the parentheses is standard GB grammar.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I mean after all, we are Rome. You Brits had your chance...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: DJK on tulkus

Content:

smcj said:

Rinpoche could have simply and easily said, "The tulku system, and the people in it, are currently demonstrating the 'suffering of change'."

The rest is just describing the specifics of the karma that is ripening.

Any educated people out there? Did I punctuate that first sentence correctly?

Malcolm wrote:

The period should go inside of closing parenthesis, like this: "The tulku system and the people in it are currently demonstrating the 'suffering of change.'"

You should also lose the commas, as above, otherwise, it should be like this "The tulku system is currently demonstrating the 'suffering of change,' as well as the people in it."

smcj said:

Thanks Malcolm. I like the second rewrite better.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on the plural or singular tense. Enclosing all punctuation inside of the closing parenthesis is hard to get used to, but it is indeed the standard approach now in academic and professional writing. I hate the editing process, and as a translator

publishing books, dealing with different editors and different style sheets can be a hassle. The 84000 project has a very solid style sheet. It is worth looking at.

Naturally, the demands on writing things here is rather less substantial, and any review of my posts will find a rich assortment of typos and misspellings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Consequences of Rejoicing

Content:

Boomerang said:

When you rejoice in another's deeds, do you create the same karmic seed as the actor?
By rejoicing in another's generosity do you create the same karma for yourself? What if you rejoice in a soldier killing their enemies?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Reality is shown only in a nonconceptual direct perception accompanied by wisdom.

Kunga Lhadzom said:

Is that the same as Primordial Awareness ?

And is this what is happening when ChNN gives a Direct Pointing out to the nature of your mind ?

And is this something understood intuitively ?

Malcolm wrote:

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. Intuitive in the philosophical sense of the term, "intuition," which means to know directly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: DJK on tulkus

Content:

smcj said:

Rinpoche could have simply and easily said, "The tulku system, and the people in it, are currently demonstrating the 'suffering of change'."

The rest is just describing the specifics of the karma that is ripening.

Any educated people out there? Did I punctuate that first sentence correctly?

Malcolm wrote:

The period should go inside of closing paranthesis, like this: "The tulku system and the people in it are currently demonstrating the 'suffering of change.'"

You should also lose the commas, as above, otherwise, it should be like this "The tulku system is currently demonstrating the 'suffering of change,' as well as the people in it."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: DJK on tulkus

Content:

Sonam Wangchug said:

He has already expressed his purpose for wearing robes, and I do not particularly think it makes him Sravaka because he is wearing maroon robes.

Malcolm wrote:

Absolutely no one said Dzongsar was a śrāvaka because he wears some kind of robes. What he himself has said in the past that he wears robes because for him, we now live in the era of the mere sign of the teachings. Adamantine asked me whether I agreed that we were in this era, and I replied, yes, at least as far as Śrāvakayāna teachings are concerned. Please read more carefully.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 10:49 AM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not what I am saying.

boda said:

Indeed you're not saying.

You've stated that reality is not capable of showing itself in more than one way. So what is this one way?

Malcolm wrote:

Reality is shown only in a nonconceptual direct perception accompanied by wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 10:40 AM

Title: Re: how do things end?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

apart from a cup that has broken and a cup that has not broken, there is no breaking cup (at present).

vinegar said:

At the time of the cup there is no broken cup..

But only a thing can be broken. Unmade things can't be broken.. there is no such thing. Meaning it's not correct to say "there is no breaking cup (at present)", don't you think?

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read Nāgārjuna's analysis of motion...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Queequeg said:

Our choices are a buffoon and an utterly immoral scoundrel. Four years of bad hair and bad reality TV, or four years of impeachment hearings.

The Cicada said:

What was it Tarantino said about Clark Kent being Superman's critique of humanity? Trump's buffoonery is as much an act as Hillary's nice-white-lady act. Trump is a lion who loves glory and I think the real Donald Trump would actually be more than a little scary to most people—which could be bad in ways, but could also be good for the presidency and for America.

Malcolm wrote:

He is a puffed up idiot with bad hair and a small dick, for which he over compensates.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Rime

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

Just wondering why Rime is not listed here, along with all the other schools of Tibetan Buddhism....

<http://rimebuddhism.com/khentrul-rinpoche/rime-philosophy/>

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a school, it is an attitude.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest

Content:

maybay said:

You learn so much its like you float around in a cloud. You see people and they might see you, but there's no contact.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is so much better to be as illiterate as those around one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

perceived by whom? by us of course. and what are we? displays of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

No, we are displays of birth, aging, sickness, and death.

boda said:

So you're essentially saying that reality only displays impermanence.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not what I am saying.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: DJK on tulkus

Content:

Adamantine said:

Hmmmnn.. but he is not a śravakayāna teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

Robes are the sign of the śravakayāna.

maybay said:

Robes are a sign of nobility, not exclusive to sravakas.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really. They are supposed to be a sign of renunciation, but since that did not work out so well, Buddha had to constantly make new rules for misbehaving bhikṣus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 24th, 2016 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Should emptiness be discussed online at all?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is not up to us to say who is ripe and who is not. We do not have that prescience.

AlexMcLeod said:

No, it is not. Even the Buddha deemed that most of his direct disciples were not ripe for it. Think you're smarter than him?

Malcolm wrote:

Huh? Don't be silly. The Buddha taught the three gates of liberation right from the beginning.

Anyway, I have a really good idea: we will talk about emptiness as much as we like, and you can ignore it, or just maintain silence. Trying to condition others is really annoying. Cut it out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: Should emptiness be discussed online at all?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It's the first taste I received, and as it says in the PP sūtra, when I first heard it, I was elated and delighted.

M

AlexMcLeod said:

But your mind was ripe for it. And most Sutra are far better teachers than any of us here. Exactly the opposite condition from that being caused by an open forum discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not up to us to say who is ripe and who is not. We do not have that prescience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Monism, Eternalism, etc

Content:

krodha said:

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:

The textbooks are full of discussion on how buddhas are persons, but not sentient beings/suffering beings (by definition not human)

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.

Alas I'm just replying to quotes, I'd much rather be debating subtle points of pramana

Buddhas are pure objects, pure persons, therefore it cannot be correct to say "persons are not products of delusion". Seems pretty straight-forward

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhas cannot be persons (gang zag) because they are not full (gang) of effluents (zag).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 10:25 PM

Title: Re: DJK on tulkus

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on what vehicle one is talking about. If we are talking about śravakayāna, then yes.

Adamantine said:

Hmmmnn.. but he is not a śravakayāna teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

Robes are the sign of the śravakayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

perceived by whom? by us of course. and what are we? displays of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

No, we are displays of birth, aging, sickness, and death.

gad rgyangs said:

...and youth, health, creativity and joy as well. At least most people are. YMMV.

Malcolm wrote:

That's the aging part.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: DJK on tulkus

Content:

maybay said:

DJK wears clothes as an expression of the teachings

Malcolm wrote:

Are you sure? You've asked him?

Adamantine said:

This comes back to his statement "In Buddhism, we talk about several different stages of degeneration. There's one degenerated time that Buddha called tagtsam zinpey du, the time when monastic robes are maintained just as a mark or symbol. That's where we are now. At least I'm trying to hold on to that symbol."

I am not sure if that qualifies as an expression of the teachings, as I doubt the teachings recommend doing this. It sounds like he is just referring to a prophecy which probably saw wearing monastic robes as a symbol without keeping the vows as being one type of degeneration. So that would bring it back to self-expression. But out of curiosity Malcolm, would you agree that we are in the time called tagtsam zinpey du? Are you familiar with the prophecy and statements he is citing? This seems like it would fall into your area of scholarly expertise.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on what vehicle one is talking about. If we are talking about śravakayāna, then yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: DJK on tulkus

Content:

maybay said:

DJK wears clothes as an expression of the teachings

Malcolm wrote:

Are you sure? You've asked him?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: DJK on tulkus

Content:

Adamantine said:

If Lamas are teaching Westerners on thrones or on stages wearing special robes, and the disciples are discouraged from ever wearing these types of robes but only wearing their regular work clothes or sunday-best (i.e. church clothes from a Christian culture) it creates a wider gap-- separation between teacher and student.

Malcolm wrote:

Generally speaking, my teacher usually wears a track suit or Hawaiian shirts when he teaches and gives empowerments.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 8:19 PM

Title: Re: Should emptiness be discussed online at all?

Content:

AlexMcLeod said:

Emptiness doctrine should not be the very first taste of Buddhism a person should receive. It is advanced teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

It's the first taste I received, and as it says in the PP sūtra, when I first heard it, I was elated and delighted.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 6:58 PM

Title: Re: DJK on tulkus

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Tulku system is not a meaningless tradition.

Tulku system is a method of preserving lineages.

Malcolm wrote:

A bad one.

BuddhaFollower said:

It has worked pretty well after the Chinese invasion.

Malcolm wrote:

It is even more corrupt now than ever before.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 6:56 PM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

However, I would say that reality displays itself in infinite ways, including, but not limited to, everything we experience in this 3D realm.

Malcolm wrote:

No, reality is perceived in a myriad of ways. It does not, nor is it capable of showing itself in more than one way.

gad rgyangs said:

perceived by whom? by us of course. and what are we? displays of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

No, we are displays of birth, aging, sickness, and death.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 10:55 AM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

thats a cop-out. Its a simple question: "How do you know that 'there is only one entry way to knowledge of reality'"?

Malcolm wrote:

The answer, simply put, is that reality does not, in reality, display itself in myriad ways.

gad rgyangs said:

the question was about your assertion that "there is only one entry way to knowledge of reality", not about how reality "displays itself".

However, I would say that reality displays itself in infinite ways, including, but not limited to, everything we experience in this 3D realm.

Malcolm wrote:

No, reality is perceived in a myriad of ways. It does not, nor is it capable of showing itself in more than one way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 9:53 AM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

how do you know?

Malcolm wrote:

The real question is why you don't.

gad rgyangs said:

thats a cop-out. Its a simple question: "How do you know that 'there is only one entry way to knowledge of reality'"?

Malcolm wrote:

The answer, simply put, is that reality does not, in reality, display itself in myriad ways.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 9:19 AM

Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

what he's saying is perfectly clear and understandable.

Malcolm wrote:
So you think.

dzogchungpa said:
Perhaps you could give Rinpoche some pointers on how to express himself more clearly and understandably. I'm sure it would be much appreciated.

Malcolm wrote:
I would rather admonish you all about not studying properly.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 9:09 AM
Title: Re: DJK on tulkus
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
..... DJKR seems to have no allegiance to the stodgy, stale tradition-for-traditions-sake-at-all-costs attitude, I greatly appreciate his point of view.

BuddhaFollower said:
Tulku system is not a meaningless tradition.

Tulku system is a method of preserving lineages.

Malcolm wrote:
A bad one.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 9:08 AM
Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
umm... here's the context:

Malcolm wrote:
I wish people would understand the context from which he says stuff like this.

gad rgyangs said:
what he's saying is perfectly clear and understandable.

Malcolm wrote:

So you think.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 9:05 AM

Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I wish people would pay more attention when he says stuff like this.

Malcolm wrote:

I wish people would understand the context from which he says stuff like this.

gad rgyangs said:

umm... here's the context:

Malcolm wrote:

I wish people would understand the context from which he says stuff like this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 9:00 AM

Title: Re: how do things end?

Content:

AlexMcLeod said:

This person's misunderstanding is a direct result of the people of this forum ignoring their vows.

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously? Get real man.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 6:16 AM

Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I wish people would pay more attention when he says stuff like this.

Malcolm wrote:

I wish people would understand the context from which he says stuff like this.

maybay said:

How would that change the meaning in this instance? What good are teachings of definitive meaning if they're context dependent?

Malcolm wrote:

One should understand that there are five Samantabhadras, not only one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: how do things end?

Content:

vinegar said:

Consider a cup that is falling and a moment later breaks on the floor

The cup has to be there to break, in which case, its not broken/didn't break.

Then when does the cup break, if not at the time of its breaking?

Suppose someone says then, the cup doesn't have to be there to break, in which case, there's nothing there to break

Malcolm wrote:

It is the same as Nāgārjuna's analysis of motion: apart from a cup that has broken and a cup that has not broken, there is no breaking cup (at present).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

A text attributed to Padmasambhava through Yeshe Tsogyal, his Tantric disciple, wife-consort, and scribe, known as Self-Liberation By Meditation Upon the Peaceful and Wrathful Deities (subtitled): "The Yoga of Knowing the Mind, the Seeing of Reality, Called Self-Liberation," uncompromisingly emphasizes this view :

"There being really no duality, pluralism is untrue. Until duality is transcended and at-one-ment realized, Enlightenment cannot be attained. The whole Sangsara and Nirvana, as an inseparable unity, are one's mind."

<http://www.buddhistgeeks.com/2010/05/maha-ati-natural-liberation-through-primordial-awareness/>

Malcolm wrote:

I would not put a lot of emphasis on this translation. It is poorly edited, and the person

(Evans-Wentz] in whose book this is found understood nothing about the subject matter that interested him

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 3:52 AM

Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I have never bothered to explain what ChNN means to people like you, since you basically do not give a shit what I say. So why would I bother?

dzogchungpa said:

OK, you're off the hook.

Malcolm wrote:

As far as I can tell, you are not even interested in Dzogchen.

dzogchungpa said:

I'm kind of curious about it.

Malcolm wrote:

You are not going to understand it through mere curiosity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I wish people would pay more attention when he says stuff like this.

Malcolm wrote:

I wish people would understand the context from which he says stuff like this.

dzogchungpa said:

Yes, it is good that we have people like you to explain Rinpoche's words for us.

Malcolm wrote:

I have never bothered to explain what ChNN means to people like you, since you basically do not give a shit what I say. So why would I bother? As far as I can tell, you are not even interested in Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: DJK on tulkus

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am being totally fair. Materialism doesn't "grow" in the way he suggests. You think our civilization is more materialistic than ancient Rome? Ancient China? Ancient India? Ancient Tibet? Please. I do recall a famous king in India who slaughtered many hundreds of thousands of people, and then got religion because he felt bad about it.

dzogchungpa said:

Whatevs, my point is that he was not suggesting that materialism and affluence had not found their way into Tibetan monasteries and religious institutions from the beginning.

Malcolm wrote:

What he said was:

The world's growing materialism and affluence have found their way into our monasteries and religious institutions...

The world's? Come on, be honest, DKR and put down your romanticism. Your Tibetan monasteries have been rife with materialism right from the beginning. Padmasambhava stated to Nyang Tingzin Zangpo:

Having assembled here, you all must listen well. The minds of all these Buddhists of Tibet, for the most part, have never been prepared. So in all of their religious activity thoughts of death and impermanence have not arisen in their minds. If it had arisen, this laziness and indolence would have never existed. They have never understand the characteristics of samsara. If they had understood, they never would have been attached to things. They have never contemplated the difficulty of obtaining leisure and wealth. If they had contemplated, these meaningful activities would have done at once. They have never understood this presentation of their minds. If they had understood it, they would have left non-virtue immediately. They have not seen the benefits and qualities of virtue. If they had seen it, distractions from gathering the two accumulations would have never occurred. They have never approached the profound path even a little. If they had approached it, they could not bear to be separate from meditation and practice. They have never approached the direction of the Mahāyāna bodhicitta. [3/a] If they had approached it, they would work on behalf of others without looking for their own advantage. They have no inclination for ultimate reality. If they had, this jealousy and pride would have never occurred. They have never heard nor contemplated the nine vehicles. If they had done so, they would understand the difference between higher and lower. They have never approached the direction of the view of secret mantra. If they had approach it, they would not accept and reject nirvana and samsara. They have never comprehended the view of reality. If they had, this ordinary grasping behavior would have never occurred. None of them ever desired to obtain complete buddhahood. If they had, they would have given up the activities of this life as unnecessary. Again, none of them have interest in Dharma apart from a few.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 3:23 AM

Title: Re: Dependent Origination and the Cosmological Argument

Content:

Jeff H said:

1. Dependent origination = own-being? How can that be? What does it mean to be “dependent on another in an absolute sense”?

Malcolm wrote:

Dependent existence (parabhāva) is not the same thing as dependent origination (pratītyasamutpāda)

2. Miphamfan said, “the chain of causes is never-ending”; Wayfarer said, “[the chain of causes] ceases with ‘nirodha’, cessation”; Malcom said, “Cessation is simply the absence of causes for further arising”. Your (Malcolm’s) post sounds like you mean to contradict Wayfarer, but you seem to be saying the same thing. He didn’t mention the cessation of entities.

Confused.

[/quote]

The manner in which Wayfarer has stated this is such that it he appears to be saying that with nirodha, the chain of causation ceases.

What I am saying is that the absence of causes is nirodha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: DJK on tulkus

Content:

Miroku said:

Do you think there really is a way in which tulku tradition could stay alive and actually become credible?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: DJK on tulkus

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

While there is much to applaud in DKR's missive, there are troubling blind spots, even still:

The world's growing materialism and affluence have found their way into our

monasteries and religious institutions, where many high lamas and especially lineage holders now lead a lifestyle so lavish and estranged from ordinary realities that they could almost be emperors!

This is a farce. Materialism and affluence have found their way into Tibetan monasteries and religious institutions from the beginning. The reason Langdarma was assassinated was not because he was going to destroy the monasteries, it was because he decided that they were bleeding the Tibetan economy dry, and so decided to tax them.

Materialism and affluence have plagued Tibetan Buddhism from the beginning, so this is nothing new.

dzogchungpa said:

The very next sentence after the paragraph you quote reads: This may have worked – and I am not saying it did work – in Tibet, where few questions were asked and where there was little scrutiny and huge devotion.

so I don't think you are being fair, as he clearly acknowledges that it was also an issue in Tibet. I think what he is saying is that the materialism and affluence of the world is growing so that, while it was always a problem in Tibetan monasteries and religious institutions, it is now even more of a problem etc. Just sayin'.

Malcolm wrote:

I am being totally fair. Materialism doesn't "grow" in the way he suggests. You think our civilization is more materialistic than ancient Rome? Ancient China? Ancient India? Ancient Tibet? Please. I do recall a famous king in India who slaughtered many hundreds of thousands of people, and then got religion because he felt bad about it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

As ChNN says in "On The Nature Of Samantabhadra - A Conversation with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu": So what is called the primordial Buddha, or Adibuddha, is only a metaphor for our true condition.

gad rgyangs said:

I wish people would pay more attention when he says stuff like this.

Malcolm wrote:

I wish people would understand the context from which he says stuff like this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 23rd, 2016 at 3:04 AM

Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

As ChNN says in "On The Nature Of Samantabhadra - A Conversation with Chogyal Namkhai Norbu": So what is called the primordial Buddha, or Adibuddha, is only a metaphor for our true condition.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is called basis Samantabhadra, one of the five kinds of Samantabhadra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are 84,000 afflictions, that is why there are eighty four thousands "gates of Dharma." But in reality, Buddha taught only three gates of liberation: emptiness, signlessness and wishlessness.

Kunga Lhadzom said:

Ok, but i read somewhere that even Nirvana does NOT exist. (Nirvanalessness ?)

<http://theendlessfurther.com/the-three-gates-of-freedom/>

Malcolm wrote:

Nirvana is not a thing. It is a state where one is free of afflictions that cause further rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One can have all kinds of perspectives of a structure. But like a house with only a single door, there is only one entry way to knowledge of reality.

gad rgyangs said:

how do you know?

Malcolm wrote:

The real question is why you don't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

This is pretty clear to me, as is most stuff that i have read. I don't think I'm that delusional that i can't comprehend words and the concepts described reasonably well...but there's always a secret meaning to confuse those like me, that are not high on the list of initiates...lowly practitioners, like me that do not deserve to know the truth.....because i haven't done millions of anything to purify all my sins. So unless you are lilly white pure, you're screwed...

Malcolm wrote:

It is not the case that you are not deserving. There is no such thing. It may be the case that you do not have access to a good teacher.

You must remember that Buddhadharma is an oral tradition at heart. Without that oral lineage, you will not absorb the meaning of the teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Illuminating Quotes by Malcolm Namdrol-la

Content:

Kim said:

I've also seen many wonderful quotes by Malcolm. Thank you for them.

May I ask if you/he has any formal qualification? Is he a holder of some lineage?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I have formal qualifications.

Kim said:

Wonderful. In which traditions? Given by who?

Malcolm wrote:

I completed a three year solitary retreat of mixed Sakya and Nyingma practices, between 1993 and 1997.

I was given the title "Ācarya" (slob dpon) by Khenpo Migmar Tseten, Buddhist Chaplain of Harvard, Sakya, in 2004.

I was encouraged to teach by the late Kunzang Dechen Lingpa in 2006, who confirmed my Ācarya title, and also conferred the formal Ngakpa ordination upon me.

I was given the title of "Lama" by Lama Ngawang Tsultrim of Dongag Tharling in New Orleans, Nyingma, in 2008.

I am a Doctor of Tibetan Medicine, having graduated from the Shang Shung Medical School in 2009.

I have a forthcoming book, a translation of a seminal text in the Dzogchen tradition, available from Wisdom Pub., Dec. 6th, 2016.

Any qualities I possess I derive from the kindness of my gurus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Dependent Origination and the Cosmological Argument

Content:

Wayfarer said:

So clearly they diverge on that point, but I am interested in that aspect of similarity. Both are alike in saying that beings are not possessed of their own originating ground, cause or essence (= are empty of own-being).

Malcolm wrote:

Dependent existence is carefully articulated by Nāgārjuna to be a kind of "own-being." Thus, beings who are dependent on another in an absolute sense, have own-being.

MiphamFan said:

Dependent origination itself means that the chain of causes is never-ending. It might be never-ending in one sense, but in another sense, it ceases with 'nirodha', cessation, does it not?

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that an entity ceases is annihilationism. This is rejected by the Buddha. Cessation is simply the absence of causes for further arising. In this way there is cessation without any entity ceasing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

What about Longchenpa's statements of everything being equalalso a misleading statement and not to be taken literally ???

That's why i see so many discrepancies & my faith is dissolving...nearly everything i read and hold dear to my heart, i find out i misinterpreted it.

Malcolm wrote:

Then the fault lies in your interpretation and not in the material you read.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: DJK on tulkus

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

While there is much to applaud in DKR's missive, there are troubling blind spots, even still:

The world's growing materialism and affluence have found their way into our monasteries and religious institutions, where many high lamas and especially lineage holders now lead a lifestyle so lavish and estranged from ordinary realities that they could almost be emperors!

This is a farce. Materialism and affluence have found their way into Tibetan monasteries and religious institutions from the beginning. The reason Langdarma was assassinated was not because he was going to destroy the monasteries, it was because he decided that they were bleeding the Tibetan economy dry, and so decided to tax them.

Materialism and affluence have plagued Tibetan Buddhism from the beginning, so this is nothing new.

He continues:

On the other hand, I also have genuine empathy for the labrang, monks, and others responsible for training our young incarnate lamas. They generally mean so well and have such good intentions, but they just don't know how to raise a child in today's world, and have simply not adapted to current conditions.

The real question arises: was there ever a system in Tibetan monasteries that properly raised children? I don't think so. Children are meant to be raised in families with mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, cousins, aunts, uncles, and grandparents.

This last I whole heartedly agree with:

For this reason, I've also advised my friends, colleagues, and fellow Rinpoches time and again that, when they teach non-Tibetans, they should not encourage the wearing of Tibetan robes or any sort of Buddhist garb. By contrast, seeing a Buddhist practitioner in army uniform, suit and tie, or other normal dress sends the message that Buddhism can be practised by everyone.

The moment a lama imposes some sort of special robes, which is such a deeply ingrained habit, it immediately excludes others and creates a cultish atmosphere. In my view, one of the key reasons the number of Buddhists worldwide is decreasing while other religions like Islam are growing is our habit of introverted exclusivism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 8:34 PM

Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest

Content:

Kim said:

You missed the point. I am not talking about J Akhon Lhamo but about the confirmation given to her by a highly regarded buddhist lama.

Malcolm wrote:

Not all confirmations are what they appear to be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 11:31 AM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

a house with only a single door, there is only one entry way to knowledge of reality.

Kunga Lhadzom said:

Then why are there 84,000 gates ?

Malcolm wrote:

There are 84,000 afflictions, that is why there are eighty four thousands "gates of Dharma." But in reality, Buddha taught only three gates of liberation: emptiness, signlessness and wishlessness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 11:15 AM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

and what are you claiming is my "tenet"? I never said that all perspectives are "equally mistaken", I just said that they are perspectives, which by definition are limited. Limited, and therefore, mistaken regarding what they purport to describe.

gad rgyangs said:

if we are both looking at a house, we will see slightly different views of it based on our perspective. Are our views mistaken because they represent a perspective and not some kind of "god's eye" view of things? No, of course not: a sentient being is a perspective, that is what a sentient being is. get used to it. Now, all philosophies, religions and mythologies are products of sentient beings, ergo they are limited perspectives. They are not mistaken, just like poems are not mistaken but rather express the perspectives and experiences of sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

One can have all kinds of perspectives of a structure. But like a house with only a single door, there is only one entry way to knowledge of reality.

gad rgyangs said:

The point, when discussing reality, is that regardless of how many faulty descriptions there may be of it, the one correct description will allow one to realize it.

it would be a sad, impoverished reality that was completely capturable by the limited languages on this one particular planet.

Malcolm wrote:

There is but a single correct description of it in all languages, whatever they may be, whatever corresponds to "dependently originated," empty," and "natureless."

When you have discovered that, it is pointless to engage in a quixotic defense of "diverse expressions."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 10:34 AM

Title: Re: Illuminating Quotes by Malcolm Namdrol-la

Content:

Adamantine said:

He's got the qualification of having made nearly 20,000 posts here! Holy!

Malcolm wrote:

Among other things....yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 10:33 AM

Title: Re: Quality of Sanskrit Texts

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Only to westerners.

Astus said:

Why would that be? History is not a purely Western field of study. The Japanese are at the top level in Buddhist studies, and most Asian Buddhist countries are catching up. The historical perspective gained currency among Asian Buddhists in the 19th century, and has been found a valid method in researching past events. The Taisho Tripitaka compiled in 1924 is an obvious example. So it might be that only Tibetans have not yet caught up with the rest of the world.

heart said:

Or that the rest of the world haven't caught up with how it really is.

/magnus

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 10:32 AM

Title: Re: Quality of Sanskrit Texts

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Only to westerners.

Astus said:

Why would that be? History is not a purely Western field of study. The Japanese are at the top level in Buddhist studies, and most Asian Buddhist countries are catching up.

Malcolm wrote:

For all intents and purposes, they are a modern, western industrialized nation.

Astus said:

The historical perspective gained currency among Asian Buddhists in the 19th century, and has been found a valid method in researching past events. The Taisho Tripitaka compiled in 1924 is an obvious example. So it might be that only Tibetans have not yet caught up with the rest of the world.

Malcolm wrote:

Only the Tibetans have understood that narratives beings written by Buddhologists have nothing to do with the narratives they find meaningful because they don't really give a shit about Buddhologists, and neither do I.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 10:29 AM

Title: Re: Illuminating Quotes by Malcolm Namdrol-la

Content:

Kim said:

I've also seen many wonderful quotes by Malcolm. Thank you for them.

May I ask if you/he has any formal qualification? Is he a holder of some lineage?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I have formal qualifications.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 10:13 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism and bon

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Loden Nyingpo revealed the myth of Tonpa Shenrab in the 14th century.

.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the first major bio of Tonpa Shenrab was revealed in the early 11th century by Shenchen Luga.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 10:03 AM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

are poems true or false or mistaken? the only thing they are mistaken about is their triumphalism.

Malcolm wrote:

Your tenet is self-deafating since it negates the function of conventional truth. As Nāgārjuna states:

The Dharma explained by the Buddha properly relies on two truths:
relative truth and ultimate truth.

Someone who does not know the distinction between those two truths
does not know the profound principle of the teaching of the Buddha.

The ultimate cannot be explained without relying on convention.

Nirvana cannot be obtained without realizing the ultimate.

gad rgyangs said:

thats all well and good, but that passage only makes sense within the universe of
Buddhist discourse (and even there it is not demonstrable, and must be taken on faith),
and cannot be used in a meta-discussion about the validity of religious systems in
general.

Malcolm wrote:

That is a nice sentiment, but I don't agree.

gad rgyangs said:

and what are you claiming is my "tenet"? I never said that all perspectives are "equally

mistaken", I just said that they are perspectives, which by definition are limited.

Malcolm wrote:

Limited, and therefore, mistaken regarding what they purport to describe.

gad rgyangs said:

Claiming this does not "negate the function of conventional truth", it in fact affirms that all conceptually enunciated truths are conventional by definition and not definitive.

Malcolm wrote:

In order for a convention to be a convention, it must correspond to some function. The classic example is seeing one moon in the sky. When two moons are seen, this is not a conventional truth for those who are sober.

The point, when discussing reality, is that regardless of how many faulty descriptions there may be of it, the one correct description will allow one to realize it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

One thing I've noticed is that lamas are often more open-minded than their students.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends very much on the lama. And they are often too polite to let their students know what they really think.

dzogchungpa said:

It is good that we have people like you to let us know what they really think.

Malcolm wrote:

I've hung out with a lot of lamas. Their attitudes on many things often come as a major surprise to their students, you know, like supporting the invasion of Iraq by W.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Quality of Sanskrit Texts

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Which is relevant to whom, exactly?

Astus said:

Good question. I think it matters in case of interschool debates when historicity is

brought into the argument.

Malcolm wrote:
Only to westerners.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 2:18 AM
Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest
Content:

Lhakpa said:
So I'm not saying that Seagal is a tulku...

Malcolm wrote:
He is indeed a tulku, recognized by Penor Rinpoche, in fact.

Lhakpa said:
I just meant I'm not trying to argue he is or isn't, just that he had a positive influence on me personally... which you of course don't have to be a tulku to do Still, I guess I'm less cynical about it than a lot of people I've seen.

Malcolm wrote:
David Carradine had a similar positive effect on me.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 2:16 AM
Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
One thing I've noticed is that lamas are often more open-minded than their students.

Malcolm wrote:
That depends very much on the lama. And they are often too polite to let their students know what they really think.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 2:10 AM
Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest
Content:

Lhakpa said:
So I'm not saying that Seagal is a tulku...

Malcolm wrote:

He is indeed a tulku, recognized by Penor Rinpoche, in fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: There's buddhadharma and then there the rest

Content:

Kim said:

I have no exposure to Jetsunma Akhon Lhamo except seeing one video of her. My first impression of her is that she is quite un-orthodox. Perhaps that's why to me she seemed fresh in her presentation.

Malcolm wrote:

One must take care with regards to teachers one finds on the internet, including those recognized as reincarnations.

Caveat emptor

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 1:24 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.

Malcolm wrote:

But the corollary you attempt to draw, i.e., that they are all equally mistaken concerning reality is false.

gad rgyangs said:

are poems true or false or mistaken? the only thing they are mistaken about is their triumphalism.

Malcolm wrote:

Your tenet is self-deafeating since it negates the function of conventional truth. As Nāgārjuna states:

The Dharma explained by the Buddha properly relies on two truths:
relative truth and ultimate truth.
Someone who does not know the distinction between those two truths
does not know the profound principle of the teaching of the Buddha.
The ultimate cannot be explained without relying on convention.
Nirvana cannot be obtained without realizing the ultimate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 12:57 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 said:

A comforting thought for perennialists, perhaps.

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.

Malcolm wrote:

But the corollary you attempt to draw, i.e., that they are all equally mistaken concerning
reality is false.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 22nd, 2016 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Quality of Sanskrit Texts

Content:

Astus said:

= from a modern historical point of view...

Malcolm wrote:

Which is relevant to whom, exactly?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 21st, 2016 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: Quality of Sanskrit Texts

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen teachings are the earliest Buddhist teachings, predating all others by eons and eons.

Astus said:

Dzogchen may teach that there was a first buddha. But I think everyone else says that there is no beginning of buddhas. So I guess infinite beats first.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, what Dzogchen teachings says concerning this is that in every eon from beginningless time, Dzogchen teachings appear first and disappear last.

So, we have our cake and can eat it too...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 21st, 2016 at 6:52 AM

Title: Re: Quality of Sanskrit Texts

Content:

jmlee369 said:

The notion that the Pali scriptures somehow capture the original words of the Buddha is a long discredited one in academia.

Astus said:

From a historical perspective, the Nikayas are still the closest to the original and the most accurate resource of the earliest teachings, as it has been confirmed through the comparative studies with the Chinese Agamas and fragments in other languages.

Malcolm wrote:

Absolutely not. Dzogchen teachings are the earliest Buddhist teachings, predating all others by eons and eons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 21st, 2016 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

If a tertön (who is not on the bhumis) receives dream teachings, do these dream teachings come from an external source?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such a thing as a tertön who is not on the bhumis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 20th, 2016 at 7:23 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

Tirisilex said:

It says here in the book "Medicine Buddha Teachings" by Khenchen Thrangu Rinpoche in the introduction page XIV "The Medicine Buddha, Vajrayogini, Tara, Vajradhara, Vajrasattva, or Chenrezig. And although it is said, from the standpoint of relative truth, that some, if not all, of these deities actually do exist as individual beings who can be supplicated, they exist as such because, and only because, the qualities that they embody were already inherent in the clear light nature, the buddha nature of their own minds."

So according to Khenchen Thrangu they do exist. Any more arguments to this statement?

Malcolm wrote:

I already answered this at length above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2016 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Choden Rinpoche on Chulen

Content:

maybay said:

The problem is they can't get the population up fast enough to handle what will happen when they make it legal. The sudden demand will be devastating. They know from experiences with ivory trade.

Malcolm wrote:

There is not a large demand for rhinoceros horn in Tibetan medicine. There is a larger demand for musk, bear bile and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2016 at 10:24 AM

Title: Re: Choden Rinpoche on Chulen

Content:

maybay said:

Is anyone else bothered by that reference to rhinoceros horn on the page
<http://www.lamayeshe.com/article/taking-essence>

Don't people know what brutalities are committed in pursuit of rhino horn and other animal parts?

Malcolm wrote:

You don't understand. In Tibetan medicine, Rhinoceros horn is used in extreme small

quantities, and from animals found deceased from natural causes.

On the other hand, musk is also used. Bear bile is used. Ox bile is used. In traditional medicine, when such animals were not killed in large numbers for sport, their byproducts are important materia medica.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2016 at 6:06 AM

Title: Re: Choden Rinpoche on Chulen

Content:

maybay said:

And for good reason. If you do it incorrectly you might just cause drought or famine.

Malcolm wrote:

Ridiculous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2016 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Bön as the 5th Tibetan Tradition.

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Unbelievable but i know you would have your reasons to claim this.

So bring some light into my ignorance, because i heard here and there bi lateral exchange of Dharma, but never heard it to the point.

So we have Sutra, Tantra and Dzogchen.

I think Bön ZZNG is 100% original Bön

So i guess Sutra like (Prasangika) Madyamika is not from Bön like the Prajnaparamita Sutras.

KY

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there is the fact that no Bonpo texts were even written down until the early eleventh century, apart from some Dunhuang finds. And Dunhuang finds about Tonpa Shenrab just do not support the elaborate bios found in the Mdo 'dus, etc.

I am happy to respect this and that narrative account as useful, inspirational chronicles, but we cannot confuse them with what we consider "history." History is secular, mundane, and injures Buddhist narratives just as much as it injures Bonpo ones.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 19th, 2016 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Bön as the 5th Tibetan Tradition.

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Bön would be derived from the other Tibetan Traditions.

Malcolm wrote:

Largely, this is the case, but it is not entirely the case.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2016 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: Bönpo Guru Rinpoche

Content:

orgyen jigmed said:

I think it would have been much better if you used the actual Bon name of Pema Thotrong

Malcolm wrote:

It's actually Pema Thongdrol (Padma who liberates through seeing.)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2016 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: Bönpo Guru Rinpoche

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Well do you maybe think there was only one Guru Rinpoche ?

Or that both were ok maybe?

Malcolm wrote:

I think there was one Guru Rinpoche, and there are three different versions of his bio: the Nyingma version, the Indian version, and the Bonpo version. They each served different needs of different communities.

kalden yungdrung said:

One thing is sure, the "GR" who did start a magical fight with a certain Bonpo, that is the one we know in Bon very well. He seems to be a Yogi from India.

That is never the same one we know in Bon.

It does not the matter which names we give to them.

Malcolm wrote:

At a certain point, you have to ask yourself, "What is the point of maintaining sectarian stories that unnecessarily alienate us from others?"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2016 at 4:06 AM

Title: Re: Bönpo Guru Rinpoche

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Well do you maybe think there was only one Guru Rinpoche ?
Or that both were ok maybe?

Malcolm wrote:

I think there was one Guru Rinpoche, and there are three different versions of his bio: the Nyingma version, the Indian version, and the Bonpo version. They each served different needs of different communities.

BuddhaFollower said:

What Indian version?

Malcolm wrote:

The one related by Buddhaguptanatha to Taranatha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2016 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: Bönpo Guru Rinpoche

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Well it is sure true that there are similarities between Bon and Vajrayana, but the lineage is different and sure if we take in consideration Bon Guru Rinpoche and the new Guru Rinpoche. So the core of the discussion is not to prove who owns what, but who did do what and under which name and certainly based on what motivation.

Malcolm wrote:

This is just a variant of the Gelug myth there was two Padmasambhavas, one bad, one good.

kalden yungdrung said:

Well do you maybe think there was only one Guru Rinpoche ?
Or that both were ok maybe?

Malcolm wrote:

I think there was one Guru Rinpoche, and there are three different versions of his bio: the Nyingma version, the Indian version, and the Bonpo version. They each served different needs of different communities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2016 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Loch Kelly

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I also see now that no less than my man Anam Thubten wrote a blurb for the book: This is one of best contemporary books on the integration of meditation and nonduality. Personally, I'm thankful to Loch for offering this gift to humanity at this crucial time when so many people are looking for living spirituality free from outdated paradigms. Read this if you want to wake up to the beautiful mystery of life.

Malcolm wrote:

It's nice to have fans.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2016 at 3:23 AM

Title: Re: Bönpo Guru Rinpoche

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Well it is sure true that there are similarities between Bon and Vajrayana, but the lineage is different and sure if we take in consideration Bon Guru Rinpoche and the new Guru Rinpoche. So the core of the discussion is not to prove who owns what, but who did do what and under which name and certainly based on what motivation.

Malcolm wrote:

This is just a variant of the Gelug myth there was two Padmasambhavas, one bad, one good.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 18th, 2016 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: The Nature of Language

Content:

Tao said:

Anyway it doesnt seem that all animals have idea of "self" or self-recognition, just a few with high mental capacities.

Malcolm wrote:

If they run away when threatened, they have a sense of self.

dzogchungpa said:

I don't see how that follows. I'd be surprised if they can't program robots to do at least primitive forms of that now. Just sayin'.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not the same. In order just to feel threatened, one must have a sense of self vs. other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2016 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Loch Kelly

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't hate Loch Kelly. I have never met him.

I was responding to some facts which are available to anyone, since someone brought up his career.

And in any case, my lack of sympathy towards "spiritual workshop" culture is well known. These teachings, sadly have no lineage to speak of, and will never last beyond the lifetime of their promulgators, whether or not they obtain the "endorsement" of this or that famous Lama, Hindu Guru or western self-proclaimed "awakened master."

dzogchungpa said:

That's really great. I still think the thread should be moved, but it doesn't really matter.

Malcolm wrote:

It would be a better idea to delete the thread in its entirety, since this is a forum for discussion of Buddhadharma, and not Milanese stews.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2016 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Loch Kelly

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

... Caucasian Tibetan Buddhist teachers...never recognize the conceptualizing mind.

Malcolm wrote:

That is a huge overgeneralization, so huge as certainly to be false.

dzogchungpa said:

I don't know how huge it is, but it is certainly false.

Mods, since this thread seems to be turning into a "Let's All Hate On Loch Kelly" thread, perhaps it could be moved to a more appropriate forum?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't hate Loch Kelly. I have never met him.

I was responding to some facts which are available to anyone, since someone brought up his career.

And in any case, my lack of sympathy towards "spiritual workshop" culture is well known. These teachings, sadly have no lineage to speak of, and will never last beyond the lifetime of their promulgators, whether or not they obtain the "endorsement" of this or that famous Lama, Hindu Guru or western self-proclaimed "awakened master."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2016 at 11:25 PM

Title: Re: Loch Kelly

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

... Caucasian Tibetan Buddhist teachers...never recognize the conceptualizing mind.

Malcolm wrote:

That is a huge overgeneralization, so huge as certainly to be false.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2016 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: The Nature of Language

Content:

Tao said:

Anyway it doesnt seem that all animals have idea of "self" or self-recognition, just a few with high mental capacities.

Malcolm wrote:

If they run away when threatened, they have a sense of self.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2016 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: Loch Kelly

Content:

JAC72 said:

This is a pretty typical way to talk about whether the host can get enough people to attend for a teacher to accept an invitation to spend 5 days including travel. You can easily look at the fees on Loch's website which are reasonable and similar to other dharma teachers.

Malcolm wrote:

I have never heard of such arrangement being required by any Dharma teacher that I know of, up to and including HH Sakya Trizin. HH Dalai Lama is a different case, because, as a former head of state, he travels with an entourage.

In my opinion, apart from travel expenses, no Dharma teacher worth their salt should have any expectation of making a profit from their teachings. Making a profit from teaching Dharma is extremely gauche. Should students wish to make donations out of their devotion to this or that teacher, this is fine. When students understand that they must collaborate together to cover expenses and so forth in order to invite a teacher, this is also fine. But to set fees with the notion that teaching 1-5 students is too few in order to spend 5 days working with them is extremely saddening.

Now of course, if one is teaching inside of an institution like Omega or Kripalu, etc., these companies set a fee structure out of which a teacher will be paid. But the idea that someone decides to teach students based on whether there are "enough" students, especially in the case of teachings derived from the Tibetan and other traditions which have traditionally circulated in small groups, is exceedingly strange.

JAC72 said:

2. Loch is a wonderful person who has mainly done clinical social work in New York City with the severely mentally ill, the homeless and families of 9/11, where he was a first responder.

Malcolm wrote:

Being a Dharma teacher has a different set of qualifications than does being a wonderful person, etc. The latter is not necessarily commensurate with the former.

Of course, people are free and they can do what they like.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2016 at 8:44 AM

Title: Re: Loch Kelly

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

Well..what did he realize when he saw the morning star ?

In seeing the morning star and exclaiming, "I and all sentient beings on earth, together, attain enlightenment at the same time,"

<http://www.abuddhistlibrary.com/Buddhism/C%20-%20Zen/Modern%20Teachers/John%20Daido%20Looi%20-%20Dharma%20Talks/Dharma%20Discourse%20Trusting%20Buddha.htm>

Malcolm wrote:

This is a late Chan story. It is not to be taken literally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2016 at 7:56 AM

Title: Re: Loch Kelly

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. But more than that, the nonduality people like Kelley, etc., don't have the same idea of awakening as the one found in Buddhadharma.

Kunga Lhadzom said:

But didn't Buddha even say upon his Enlightenment, that everyone/everything was Enlightened simultaneously ?

You can't get more non-dual than that...

Malcolm wrote:

No, the Buddha never said this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2016 at 7:40 AM

Title: Re: Loch Kelly

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on what one means by the term awakening.

Kunga Lhadzom said:

So you can be awake but not fully Enlightened ?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. But more than that, the nonduality people like Kelley, etc., don't have the same idea of awakening as the one found in Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2016 at 6:40 AM

Title: Re: Loch Kelly

Content:

Kunga Lhadzom said:

Who care's if it's Buddhadharma or not....i don't think Awakening is intended for only Buddhists...that's why there are 84,000 gates.

I loved his beautiful smile.

And i thought he was sincere.

And i watched the whole video.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on what one means by the term awakening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2016 at 4:06 AM

Title: Re: Loch Kelly

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Here's an 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]
```

I haven't watched it yet but I've often found these BATGAP interviews to be a good way to get a sense of where someone is coming from.

Malcolm wrote:

Spirituality Lite™. It's less filling!

Seriously though, his idea about awakening have nothing to do with Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 17th, 2016 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, sure, since Advaita is knock off version of Yogacara Madhyamaka with an eternalist slant.

Losal Samten said:

As in Shantarakshita's YC-MA? Or you mean Yogacara's Madhyamaka exegesis. Isn't Advaita basically Yogacara with a transpersonal perfected nature?

According to this, Ratnakirti actually expressed that view; dunno if it has any basis:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ratnak%C4%ABrti>

Malcolm wrote:

As in Gaudapada's Agama Shastra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 16th, 2016 at 7:33 AM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.

Content:

Simon E. said:

Ok let's ask him. Did you Malcolm?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, sure, since Advaita is knock off version of Yogacara Madhyamaka with an eternalist slant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 15th, 2016 at 9:49 AM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Zag bcas is an adjective, emotion is a noun. Definitely a poor translation choice. But hey, since DKR is a tulku, he can ride roughshod over any language he likes, right?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 15th, 2016 at 3:31 AM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

what translation? im sure he was speaking english.

Simon E. said:

But he translated from the Tibetan or used an existing translation.

gad rgyangs said:

are you saying he doesnt know the difference between a "klesha" and an "emotion"?

Malcolm wrote:

He may not. ChNN uses the term "emotion" for kleśa (nyon mongs) regularly.

OED:

Emotion:

a natural instinctive state of mind deriving from one's circumstances, mood, or relationships with others:

Monier-Williams

gad rgyangs said:

kleśa:

kleza m. pain , affliction , distress , pain from disease , anguish S3vetUp. Mn. Ya1jn5. MBh. &c. ; (in Yoga phil. five Kles3as are named , viz. %a-vidyA} , ` " ignorance " , %asmi-tA} , egotism " , %rAga} , ` " desire " , %dveSa} , ` " aversion " , and %abhiniveza} , tenacity of mundane existence " Yogas. Prab. Sarvad. ; the Buddhists reckon ten , viz. three of the body [murder , theft , adultery] , four of speech [lying , slander , abuse , unprofitable conversation] , three of the mind [covetousness , malice , scepticism] Buddh. Sarvad.) ; wrath , anger L. ; worldly occupation , care , trouble (= %vyavasAya}) L.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 15th, 2016 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Nope.

Malcolm wrote:

So which of the four do not accept? Why? Barring inadequate translation issues (like emotion = kleśa, etc.)

gad rgyangs said:

what translation? im sure he was speaking english.

Malcolm wrote:

"all afflictions are suffering" (sarvakleśasadukham) /= "all emotions are painful"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 14th, 2016 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: What Makes You NOT A Buddhist. A reminder.

Content:

Simon E. said:

'What makes you not an informed student of the Buddhas Dharma' works just as well.

Remember that there are no 'ists' or 'isms' in Tibetan.

So Dzogchungpa, D.K.R's four points, do you accept them or not?

dzogchungpa said:

Nope.

Malcolm wrote:

So which of the four do not accept? Why? Barring inadequate translation issues (like emotion = kleśa, etc.)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 14th, 2016 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Socialism makes people selfish

Content:

conebeckham said:

Nicholas, your agenda is showing, and it's not pretty. Further, your sources are innaccurate and flawed, and here, on this Buddhist forum, you should reflect on the Dharma which teaches cause and effect. Socioeconomic systems in the real world, to say nothing of theoretical systems which cannot be realized, are codependently originated along with sentient beings, and are as much a result as a cause of behavior.

There are elements of socialism, and elements of free market capitalism, in all current societies. This windmill you keep tilting at, however, does not exist, even as a functioning appearance.

Malcolm wrote:

While indeed I think our friend Nick's crusade is indeed quixotic, he does have one good point, which is that Marxist socialism has been an abject failure, and ought to be relegated to the dustbin of history, along with a lot of other bad ideas. Which is not to say that all of Marx's ideas are bad, rather the system that arose out of them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 13th, 2016 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: Loch Kelly

Content:

Kim said:

He's been studying with these rinpoche's for a few decades.

Malcolm wrote:
What does this mean?

Sorry, but at minimum, someone who is teaching Dzogchen or Mahāmudra should at least have rudimentary grasp of Tibetan. For example, we have this fellow in Sweden who has claimed he was authorized to teach Dzogchen by TUR, but when such claims are investigated, the basis upon which they are made seems to evaporate like morning mist when the sun rises.

heart said:
Sweden? You probably mean Denmark, right?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Right, but all you Scandinavians look alike.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 13th, 2016 at 8:14 PM
Title: Re: Very clear statements about the Dzogchen path- Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche
Content:

anjali said:
In the course of conversation with a learned man who asked about Purusha and Prakriti, Sri Bhagavan said: Purusha and Prakriti are only the bifurcation of the one Supreme. They are surmised because the student has the sense of duality deep rooted.

Malcolm wrote:
Which is completely consistent with Advaita.

anjali said:
Which is contrasted with statements like,
Unless one knows oneself as the witness, ignorance, which takes the form of the ego, will not be removed.
The apparent contradiction is resolved with teaching instructions such as,

Malcolm wrote:
Which is completely consistent with Sāṃkhya and Advaita.

anjali said:
He must first discern consciousness from insentience and be the consciousness only. Later let him realise that insentience is not apart from consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:
[/quote]

Which is completely consistent with Advaita.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 13th, 2016 at 9:42 AM

Title: Re: Very clear statements about the Dzogchen path- Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I didn't bring it up, I was just responding to Astus.

Malcolm wrote:

Rebutting something you are not prepared to actually rebut? Well, I guess it is just the internet after all...

dzogchungpa said:

I said his statement was not correct. Why? Because I don't see how it could be established. I can provide more quotes that I feel support the idea that RM would not have accepted an "ultimate observer", but why bother? If this issue is important to you, why don't you contact an expert like David Godman? I'm sure he would respond.

Malcolm wrote:

No proper Saṃkhya or Advaitan would accept an ultimate buddhi/mahat. Buddhi, etc., is relative, and nonsentient.

Purusha, on the other hand, is a passive, disengaged "enjoyer" which "lights up" the tattvas from buddhi down to the element of earth.

When Purusha recognizes buddhi down to the element of earth as not being its own state, it takes the name Jñā, the knower.

The difference between Saṃkhya and Advaita is the Saṃkhya recognizes infinite separate puruṣas, whereas Advaita recognizes only one. In both cases, puruṣa is eternal.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 13th, 2016 at 7:55 AM

Title: Re: Very clear statements about the Dzogchen path- Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I didn't bring it up, I was just responding to Astus.

Malcolm wrote:

Rebutting something you are not prepared to actually rebut? Well, I guess it is just the

internet after all...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 13th, 2016 at 7:53 AM

Title: Re: Very clear statements about the Dzogchen path- Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

BTW, which Gelugpa savants conflated the two?

Malcolm wrote:

Sumpa Khenpo, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 13th, 2016 at 6:54 AM

Title: Re: Very clear statements about the Dzogchen path- Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

M.: 'Witness' is applicable when there is an object to be seen. Then it is duality. The Truth lies beyond both. In the mantra, sakshi cheta kevalo nirgunascha, the word sakshi must be understood as sannidhi (presence), without which there could be nothing. See how the sun is necessary for daily activities. He does not however form part of the world actions; yet they cannot take place without the sun. He is the witness of the activities. So it is with the Self.

Anyway, like I said I don't want to get into an argument about it.

Malcolm wrote:

This is just standard Shaiva view, ultimately rooted in the Saṃkhya notion of Puruṣa/Jñā.

People who study tenet systems and Dzogchen view properly would recognize this instantly. Frankly, people who do not study tenets and Dzogchen view in a proper frequently conflate the two, as have a number of Gelugpa savants.

Finally, if you don't want to get into arguments about this or that, don't bring it up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 13th, 2016 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: Very clear statements about the Dzogchen path- Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

As far as a meditation instruction? All over the place iirc. I've seen the same instruction

in Mahamudra writings I'm certain, heck..I think I even read some Thai Forest people and Zen people with the instruction to observe the observer, know the knower etc. Not saying it's the same thing exactly in those contexts of course...

Astus said:

Mahamudra vipasyana instruction starts with first observing the mind, then thoughts, then external phenomena. As for Zen, it is one of the first questions (huatou) given: Who is it?; or in China especially: Who is reciting the name? (i.e. asking this while chanting Namu Amituo Fo). By the way, Neo-Advaita has this method as well, particularly in Ramana's community, since they actually believe in an ultimate observer.

dzogchungpa said:

Gnothi seauton and all that. I don't want to get into a big argument about this as it is off-topic, but your statement about Ramana and his "community" is not correct.

Malcolm wrote:

Can you substantiate this? Quite frankly, many claims are made about RM, but when one reads what he has actually written on this and that subject, one gets the sense that his view does not go beyond normative Hindu tropes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 13th, 2016 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: Loch Kelly

Content:

Knotty Veneer said:

When Dharma becomes your source of income...

fckw said:

Well, that's true for pretty much all Tibetan monks and nuns, as well as for ChNN and a whole series of other highly respected teachers, isn't it?

I believe that Westerners have this odd reverse prejudice against Westerners charging money for Dharma. The idea that "it should be free" actually comes from an entirely different culture where a monastic lifestyle was in a much higher regard than it is in the West. Furthermore, it's quite well known that some mahasiddhas charged their students outrageous amounts of money for transmission of a certain teaching cycle, yet others again gave teachings to their students for free.

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN has a pension.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 13th, 2016 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Loch Kelly

Content:
Kim said:
He's been studying with these rinpoche's for a few decades.

Malcolm wrote:
What does this mean?

Sorry, but at minimum, someone who is teaching Dzogchen or Mahāmudra should at least have rudimentary grasp of Tibetan. For example, we have this fellow in Sweden who has claimed he was authorized to teach Dzogchen by TUR, but when such claims are investigated, the basis upon which they are made seems to evaporate like morning mist when the sun rises.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 13th, 2016 at 2:15 AM
Title: Re: Yidams
Content:

Anders said:
What makes one method 'manjushri method', another 'Vajrapani' method, a third 'Tara' method and a fourth 'Vajra Dakini' method?

Malcolm wrote:
Lineage, and the disposition of the one to be tamed.

Dzogchen's use of "Samantabhadra" in a similar context makes this point fairly clear (and also that there is no relation to the mahasattva "Samantabhadra")

Anders said:
But your explanation here doesn't address the 'how and why' of what looks to me like a very deliberate ongoing correlation made between the continuum mahasattvas and the yidams correspondingly named all across the board but-not-really-deities.

Malcolm wrote:
Some people are attracted to the result, Mañjuśrī, so there is a path where one identifies as Mañjuśrī to realize that result. It is very straightforward and not at all complicated.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 13th, 2016 at 2:09 AM
Title: Re: Loch Kelly
Content:
Kim said:
A person like that doesn't become new age overnight simply because the lama's

permission isn't there after all.

Malcolm wrote:

A person becomes new age when, instead of teaching Dharma, they teach a sort of Milanese Stew:

He studied Buddhism with Professor Lily de Silva at the University of Kandy, Sri Lanka, Insight Meditation with Godwin Samararatne and at the Theravada monasteries, Inter-Spiritual Contemplative Meditation with Fr. Bede Griffiths and Anthony de Mello, Advaita at Sri Ramana Ashram, and Dzogchen and Mahamudra Meditation with Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche in Nepal.

Dzogchen and Advaita (not to mention Mahāmudra) are as incompatible as day and night.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 11th, 2016 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: List five books everyone must read

Content:

Lazy Monk said:

Oh, but entertaining novels belong in the other derailed thread I started...

Agree though that Bataille was a dirty good writer. But if anyone is prepping for the dark side, I rather recommend the academic book "Serial Murderers and Their Victims", by Eric Hickey at California State University. And a book about forensic science, but only know a Norwegian book about this topic. It's certainly darker than what any novelist has managed to write.

Malcolm wrote:

But you asked for five books that everyone must read, and think these satisfy the bill.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 11th, 2016 at 8:57 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, you are such a pretentious guy. Stop telling other people how they should behave when you don't even have a handle on your own behavior.

smcj said:

If by suggesting that someone should seek out a traditional teacher for clarification on an important question such as this has offended people, I apologize.

Malcolm wrote:

You are being incredibly presumptuous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 11th, 2016 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: List five books everyone must read

Content:

Lazy Monk said:

Malcolm, your books are too onesided and not dark enough to be considered the top five essential books for mental prepping.

Malcolm wrote:

The point was neither darkness nor mental prepping, the point was literary quality and entertainment value.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 11th, 2016 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Jeff H said:

A third ticket of Stein/Sanders (or Sanders/Stein) would have, at least, provided a realistic referendum about what Americans actually want.

Malcolm wrote:

While for the time being I am going to vote for Stein, I have serious reservations about the US Green Party's adopting "eco-socialism" as the party's political ideology. I have studied it fairly closely, and as a deep green/left biocentric, I have found that it is just green washed old-school Marxism. The policies of their leading thinkers, like the Trotskyism of the past, will lead to eco-gulags, or alternately, an Eco-Stalinism, when and if Green parties gain power, and discover again that their attempt to induce a world revolution will be confined to a single country.

If people truly value the Green parties, they must resist these regressive marxist tendencies within the environmental movement. Marxist Socialism, like Capitalism, cannot solve the problems it has created.

Queequeg said:

Can you elaborate on this? Or links?

Malcolm wrote:

http://www.gp.org/green_party_moves_towards_declaring_itself_eco_socialist:

\nIn a major development, the Green Party took a key step towards declaring itself Eco-socialist. The party's National Committee voted Sunday night to approve a proposed

amendment to the party's platform entitled "Ecological Economics." The proposed platform position declares that the Green Party is anti-capitalist and in favor of a decentralized vision socialism.

Queequeg said:

The proposal to amend the 2016 platform will go to the Green Party National Convention for a final vote. The convention will be held in Houston, Texas, August 4-7, a week after the Democratic Party's National Convention. Almost 78 percent of the National Committee voted in favor of sending the proposal to the convention (76 voted "yes," 22 voted "no," with 9 voting to "abstain," on Proposal 835).

The proposal would have the Greens go on the record, for the first time, that they want to go beyond reforms intended to make capitalism greener, in favor of a democratic and decentralized conception of green socialism. The proposal, "addresses the economic inequalities, social inequalities, and productivism of both capitalism and state socialism and emphasizes grassroots democracy in the workplace. This workplace grassroots democracy has been largely absent from the Green platform, and many believe it is the way forward for a truly ecological economy and a new system...The Green Party seeks to build an alternative economic system based on ecology and decentralization of power, an alternative that rejects both the capitalist system that maintains private ownership over almost all production as well as the state-socialist system that assumes control over industries without democratic, local decision making. We believe the old models of capitalism (private ownership of production) and state socialism (state ownership of production) are not ecologically sound, socially just, or democratic and that both contain built-in structures that advance injustices...Production is best for people and planet when democratically owned and operated by those who do the work and those most affected by production decisions." <http://gp.org/cgi-bin/vote/propdetail?pid=835>

Andrea Mérida Cuéllar, the National Co-Chair of Green Party, told IndyBay, "The themes of the left that we saw develop in the early parts of the 20th century are timely again because of the economic, social and environmental upheaval wrought by late-stage capitalism. Even though these themes have been co-opted by the political center, it's clear that the working class in this country is ready for revolution. As the true left discusses reform vs. revolution, the Green Party is now uniquely positioned to finally be the electoral tactic of grassroots movements ... we are now ready to finally become the party of the 99 percent and be worthy of the attention of an anti-oppressive and leftist worker cadre."

Malcolm wrote:

The late David Orton expresses his own, milder, reservations about Ecosocialism:
David Orton on Deep Ecology and Ecosocialism

[This message was posted on the EI-Network yahoogroup on December 21, 2008. To make reading easier, I have divided several long paragraphs, but otherwise the text is unchanged. The original is here.]

Greetings ecosocialists and deep green fellow travelers:

I would like to sign on to the Belém Ecosocialist Declaration (see <http://www.ecosocialistnetwork.org/>), whose spirit I am very sympathetic to, but unfortunately I cannot. There is much I agree with, as for example the critique of the market assumptions of the climate change debate (unfortunately embraced by the Green Party in Canada and Elizabeth May, the current leader). Several people who I respect, because of their work for the natural world and for social justice, including some left biocentrists, have signed on to the Declaration.

I describe myself as someone on the socialist/communist side of the political spectrum. But I am also someone who has embraced the philosophy of deep ecology, first outlined by the Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess. This is the understanding that humans have to come into a fundamentally new ecocentric relationship with the natural world, which rejects a supposed human domination over nature. Nonhuman life and the Earth itself are to be valued independently of their usefulness for human purposes. Also, in order to thrive, human and nonhuman life need “a substantial decrease of the human population”, as the eight-point Deep Ecology Platform outlines.

This does not mean that I and other deep greens “hate socialism” as one of the signers of the declaration has alleged (Joel Kovel, *The Enemy of Nature*, second edition, p. 302). It does mean, however, that a socialist/communist perspective fundamentally influenced by deep ecology does not share some of the assumptions of this Ecosocialist Declaration.

What are some of these assumptions?

— I think the use of the term “ecosocialism” excludes options and implies that post-industrial societal models of sustainability (based on the socialist/communist tradition) already exist and can be adopted and modified. This is foolish and unfortunate Left arrogance, given the historical record. The environmental legacies of “actually existing” socialist and communist societies are quite negative. (The possible exception here would be Cuba, which has shown leadership, by example, in small plot intensive urban gardens and in developing alternatives to fossil fuel-based rural agriculture, and in the protection of the island’s natural biodiversity.)

It seems to me that “socialism” or “ecosocialism”, as a description of a future deep ecology-inspired and socially just post-capitalist society, is not adequate or inspirational. The type of future ecocentric and socially just social formations is up for discussion. There are no worked out social models that can be simply adopted. Socialism is in many ways an expression of the industrial proletariat, and while its legacy of social justice remains valid, and indeed needed for a future ecocentric society, it is not correct to say that “ecosocialism” will describe the future post-industrial ecocentric society. The features of such a society are a work in progress for all of us to engage with.

I am sympathetic to the view expressed by Saral Sarkar in his book *Eco-socialism or*

Eco-capitalism? that “There is no contradiction between socialism and a truly ecological economy if the former can be conceived of as a non-industrial society...” (p. 5)

— Stan Rowe (1918-2004), a Canadian eco-philosopher, was also a socialist. But he noted in his writings that we are first Earthlings, part of mother Earth, and only in second place human beings. For Stan, both capitalism and socialism as social systems express the basic problem of species selfishness. As he pointed out in his first book of essays *Home Place*, “Neither philosophical liberalism championing liberty nor philosophical socialism championing equality will save us from ourselves. Human history will end in ecology, or nothing.” (p. 7)

The Belém Declaration is unfortunately people-centered, not Earth-centered. Where is the advocacy for wilderness preservation and other species? Nonhuman species appear to be an afterthought. Social justice for humans is of course necessary, but it must be subordinate to Earth justice for all species. As Rowe has said, although socialism and capitalism share a common “rapacious” anthropocentric view towards Earth exploitation, “socialism has the virtue of extending the circle of care beyond the selfish individual, at least turning our vision outward in the right direction.” (p. 193) But social justice for humans cannot be at the expense of the ecology. “Community” has to include not just humans but other animals, plants and the Earth itself.

— There is no mention of population reduction in the Declaration. This should be a priority for an ecocentric socially just society. It is not only wrong from a human-welfare perspective - there are far too many of us - but it shows that the habitat needs of other life forms are not considered important.

— The Declaration assumes that it is capitalism, not industrialism, which is the main problem. Left biocentrists see industrial society’s social and technological formation as the main problem, and it can have a capitalist or a socialist face.

— The Declaration assumes “full employment for all” in the new ecosocialist society. This statement conveys that the transition will be painless, and implies that production and consumption will continue. Nothing could be further from the truth. To live sustainably will mean living with much less, along with serious redistribution of wealth to those who are economically marginalized. As has been said, the ecology movement is the first social movement in history to promise a lower material standard of living.

— I feel that generally the Declaration underplays the primary contribution of the environmental and green movements, which have not, in the main, been driven by a socialist consciousness. Socialists have mainly been in the wings, not in the activist vanguard.

— The Declaration says nothing about the need for a new Earth-centered ethics, as part of a green politics, which ends the spiritual separation of most people from the natural world.

— I think that an “Anti-Capitalist Belém Declaration” would be a more appropriate and

encompassing name. The endless growth and consumerism of capitalism has no respect for the ecological limits of the Earth or concern for fundamental social justice for all citizens. This could be a banner to rally a wide variety of opposition forces, and it could allow the needed discussion about the nature of a future Earth-friendly and socially just world society. This discussion is pre-empted by using the term “ecosocialist”.

The above should not convey that I am hostile to the Belém Ecosocialist Declaration, because I am not. I regard this Declaration as a positive development and wish to maintain a dialogue with those who sign the Declaration. There is not just one path forward for the Ecocentric Left. As Naess has said, “the front is long.” Perhaps the Declaration will be modified in a more Earth-centered direction at the forthcoming January 2009 meeting in Brazil, a vast country with a rich diversity of plant and animal life, as well as peoples from many ethnic and racial backgrounds.

For the Earth,
David Orton

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 11th, 2016 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Loch Kelly

Content:

Kim said:

What the *hell* is going on here... Someone shouts from the bushes a oneliner saying about a "misunderstanding" that Loch Kelly isn't an authorised mahamudra teacher and doesn't proof this claim in any way. And already Loch Kelly is thought of as big of a hoax as Jackson Peterson. Hello..?.

Malcolm wrote:

Let's put it this way, Kim. If someone asked me if they should study with him, I would ascertain if they were truly interested in Dharma or preferred new age workshops before issuing my recommendation. But that's just me.

Guruitis is a very serious inflammation of the brain.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 11th, 2016 at 12:22 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Jeff H said:

A third ticket of Stein/Sanders (or Sanders/Stein) would have, at least, provided a realistic referendum about what Americans actually want.

Malcolm wrote:

While for the time being I am going to vote for Stein, I have serious reservations about the US Green Party's adopting "eco-socialism" as the party's political ideology. I have studied it fairly closely, and as a deep green/left biocentric, I have found that it is just green washed old-school Marxism. The policies of their leading thinkers, like the Trotskyism of the past, will lead to eco-gulags, or alternately, an Eco-Stalinism, when and if Green parties gain power, and discover again that their attempt to induce a world revolution will be confined to a single country.

If people truly value the Green parties, they must resist these regressive marxist tendencies within the environmental movement. Marxist Socialism, like Capitalism, cannot solve the problems it has created.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 11th, 2016 at 12:12 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

Sounds like you have your own interpretation.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all, for example, the refuge prayer of Khenpo Jigphuns treasure, the Throat Locket Kilaya begins, rang rig lha la khyabs su mchi, i.e. "I go for refuge to the deity, my own vidyā." When he explained this, he explained that the deity was nothing other than the nature of ones mind, vidyā or rig pa.

smcj said:

Other Guru-Yogas do start with your human guru, go through various levels of sophistication, and end up as you say. However even what it means for your human teacher to be the focus of Guru-Yoga is usually badly misunderstood. It's not creating a cultish fixation on his personality.

The interpretations you speak of are later stages of Guru-Yoga. If your instructor has given that to you, then fine. If not, consider verifying your understanding of the subject with him. Misapplying an interpretation in the context of your practice can be an obstacle. It's not like seeing something on a menu you like and ordering at a restaurant.

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, you are such a pretentious guy. Stop telling other people how they should behave when you don't even have a handle on your own behavior.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 11th, 2016 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: List five books everyone must read

Content:

MiphamFan said:

I think the statement in that commentary should be contextualised; most likely he is referring to different tirthika philosophies (Samkhya, Advaita etc) and in the context of writing polemics in India. I think it is rather absurd if you take it literally; you end up with lamas who claim that Abhidharma cosmology must be true because it is said in the sutras and who reject modern cosmology because it is a "tirthika" thing... but Buddhists need to realise that science is just a method, a way to work with inference and induction, something which is perfectly justified even in Buddhist epistemology.

Losal Samten said:

Not to get into this, but abhidharma cosmology is perfectly viable relatively when seen via the valid cognition of pure vision

Malcolm wrote:

Umm, no. It is just the distorted picture of the planet Earth seen through early medieval Indian Buddhist eyes.

Pure vision and blurred vision should not be conflated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 11th, 2016 at 2:38 AM

Title: Re: List five books everyone must read

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

In no particular order:

I Am That - Nisargadatta

Nothing Ever Happened - David Godman

Time, Space and Knowledge - Tarthang Tulku

The Profound Treasury of the Ocean of Dharma - Chogyam Trungpa

The Mahabharata

Malcolm wrote:

Hippy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 11th, 2016 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

chimechodra said:

I think I probably know the answer to this question already, but figured it can't hurt to ask:

Is Ati Guru Yoga by itself able to maintain/strengthen your connection with the guardians/dharmapalas? Or, in order to build this relationship, is more elaborate practice absolutely necessary? Obviously I do what I can when I can, but I'm not sure I've read anything speaking one way or the other about this point as it pertains to the DC specifically.

Malcolm wrote:

As ChNN says often, the protectors are in you. So yes, Guru yoga is sufficient.

Crazywisdom said:

The Protector is another name for a Buddha. Since that is one's own nature, Guru Yoga is invoking the protector.

Malcolm wrote:

Here, I am referring to dharmapālas, not the Nātha [mgon po], a title of the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 11th, 2016 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: List five books everyone must read

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

(Oh and Buddhahood in this Life by Panchen Vimalamitra)

Lobsang Chojor said:

Should we buy the copy translated by Malcolm Smith

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think there is another translation coming out anytime soon...so...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 11th, 2016 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: List five books everyone must read

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Story of the Eye by Bataille

Diary of a Drug Fiend by Crowley

Maldoror by Lautremont

Philosophy in the Bedroom by De Sade

Nomadology by Deleuze and Guattari

(Oh and Buddhahood in this Life by Panchen Vimalamitra)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 11th, 2016 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Wisdom Books UK RIP

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Is there a connection with Wisdom Publication in Boston?

Malcolm wrote:

Many years ago. But not for a couple of decades.

Wisdom Publications is a nonprofit and sustain themselves through fundraising as much as book sales (I was an employee back in the early '90's) AFAIK.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 11th, 2016 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: Loch Kelly

Content:

philji said:

I have now discovered that his authorisation to teach by Mingyur Rinpoche is going to be removed from his website...a misunderstanding he says!!!!

Malcolm wrote:

Jax II

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 11th, 2016 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: Loch Kelly

Content:

philji said:

I am not too comfortable with his comments.. "I do feel that I get most everything they are pointing to and so I trying to convey but I try to update them where the practices at times seem archaic and too formal and miss the how-to pieces which I try to fill in in different ways."

As for fees well????!!!!

Kim said:

I'd recommend anyone to check out how he teaches mahamudra practices.

But for sure, there is a business interest there. He charges 7700 USD per weekend, plus flights, hotels and meals. He said it's perfectly fine with organisers in the US. He failed to understand that in remote European countries like the one where I live, he is practically unknown so taking a financial responsibility like that wasn't something I wanted to take. In regards to his fee, there was no mention of charity projects etc.

Malcolm wrote:

That is f\$&king outrageous.

Kim said:

He also mentioned his teacher, Mingyur, charges more than him. I don't know what to make of that.

Malcolm wrote:

I highly doubt that this is the case.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 10th, 2016 at 7:58 PM

Title: Wisdom Books UK RIP

Content:

Unknown said:

Resolutions for Winding-up

WISDOM BOOKS (DISTRIBUTION) LIMITED

(Company Number 02425147)

Registered office: 25 Stanley Road, Ilford, Essex, IG1 1RW

Principal trading address: 25 Stanley Road, Ilford, Essex, IG1 1RW

Notice is hereby given that the following resolutions were passed on 29 June 2016 as a Special Resolution and an Ordinary Resolution respectively:

“That the Company cannot, by reason of its liabilities, continue its business, and that it is advisable to wind up the same, and accordingly that the Company be wound up voluntarily and that Lee Anthony Green and Andrew Anderson Kelsall, both of Larking Gowen, King Street House, 15 Upper King Street, Norwich, NR3 1RB, (IP Nos: 015610 and 009555) be appointed as Joint Liquidators for the purposes of such voluntary winding up.”

Further details contact: Lee Green, Email: <mailto:lee.green@larking-gowen.co.uk>, Andrew Kelsall, Email: <mailto:andrew.kelsall@larking-gowen.co.uk>, Tel: 01603 624181. Alternative contact: Kerry Horne, Email: <mailto:kerry.horne@larking-gowen.co.uk>

Lee Anthony Green, Liquidator

Malcolm wrote:

<https://www.thegazette.co.uk/notice/2567056>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 10th, 2016 at 7:51 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:
I pray to you Lama Chenrezig.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, because the guru, in order to introduce you to the practice of Avalokiteśvara, must generate himself as well as vase and so on, in the form of Avalokiteśvara.

smcj said:
I pray to you Yidam Chenrezig

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, because this the path the guru has introduced you to.

smcj said:
I pray to you Perfect Noble Chenrezig.
I pray to you Lord Protector Chenrezig
I pray to you Lord of Love Chenrezig
Great Compassionate Victor, please hold us with your compassion...please bestow the blessing to obtain omniscient Buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, because Avalokiteśvara is a tenth stage bodhisattva, who is a being who has a separate continuum from you.

But for example, Hevajra was never a bodhisattva on the paths and stages, per se, there is no being with a separate continuum "Hevajra". The Hevajra mandala is a method taught by Vajradhara in the Hevajra Tantra to the tenth stage bodhisattva Vajragarbha.

Anders said:
What then is the relationship between Avalokiteśvara the mahasattva and Avalokiteśvara the yidam? Giving them similar names would imply shared identity on some level.

Malcolm wrote:
I explained this above already, but again: Avalokiteśvara the mahasattva is an independent being with his own continuum. Avalokiteśvara the yidam the is the means by which oneself may realize that same state.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 10th, 2016 at 7:49 PM
Title: Re: Loch Kelly
Content:
Kim said:

I

I invited him to teach in my country too but once he informed me of his fee demands all I could say was, "That's not OK for any dharma teacher". He got offended and never

replied to me again.

Malcolm wrote:

[P]ermitting someone with gifts in the gate,
stopping the one without gifts outside the gate—
supporting relatives by feeding them with devotional offerings;
Also leave great meditator's Dharma and go!
— Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltzen

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 10th, 2016 at 12:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

chimechodra said:

I think I probably know the answer to this question already, but figured it can't hurt to ask:

Is Ati Guru Yoga by itself able to maintain/strengthen your connection with the guardians/dharmapalas? Or, in order to build this relationship, is more elaborate practice absolutely necessary? Obviously I do what I can when I can, but I'm not sure I've read anything speaking one way or the other about this point as it pertains to the DC specifically.

Malcolm wrote:

As ChNN says often, the protectors are in you. So yes, Guru yoga is sufficient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 10th, 2016 at 12:40 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

Miphamfan said:

smcj, this is what Padmasambhava himself said.

smcj said:

If I may ask, do you have a traditional meditation instructor?

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahahahha. Don't be a ninny. Of course he does.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 10th, 2016 at 12:37 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But for example, Hevajra was never a bodhisattva on the paths and stages, per se, there is no being with a separate continuum "Hevajra". The Hevajra mandala is a method taught by Vajradhara in the Hevajra Tantra to the tenth stage bodhisattva Vajragarbha.

Fa Dao said:

ok, so how does Dorje Drolo fit into all of this Malcolm?

Malcolm wrote:

Drolo is a manifestation of Guru P. Drolo is also a yidam. They are not the same thing. The former is the result; the later is a path. Yidam practice is the method of taking the result as the path.

Hevajra, for example, is a heruka. Vajradhara manifested as Hevajra in order to tame the eight worldly gods. In this respect, Hevajra represents the result. Practicing Hevajra as a yidam is the path, in this case too, the result is taken as the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 10th, 2016 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That is a nice thing for you to say.

That said, I still say you have no idea what you are talking about. Perhaps, SMCJ, it is better for you to be a practitioner rather than a teacher giving explanations.

smcj said:

I am raising questions and encouraging people to seek out traditional teachers to answer them. That is a far cry from appointing myself teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

Honestly, appeals to authority are just not the Buddhist way, without being backed up by citation and reasoning. Otherwise, it just amounts to gossip.

The funny thing is, everything I stated, all my opinions, are grounded in traditional teachings. Actually, I am a much more traditional practitioner than you. I don't mix any western ideas or tendencies into my Dharma practice. Zero.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 10th, 2016 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

I have an enormous amount of respect for Malcolm's accomplishments. And I have huge regard for his sincerity. Those two things form a firm basis for a practice. However I disagree with many of his interpretations, which should be obvious over many threads.

Malcolm wrote:

That is a nice thing for you to say.

That said, I still say you have no idea what you are talking about. Perhaps, SMCJ, it is better for you to be a practitioner rather than a teacher giving explanations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 10th, 2016 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

Simon E. said:

Dont you know Dzogchungpa?

dzogchungpa said:

In general, no, but believe it or not, the question was raised at the first major empowerment I attended. At first the Lama himself was unsure, but it seems the answer is black in this case.

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on the Yidam. Śākyamuni's eyes are blue. But often enough, they are black.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 10th, 2016 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

I pray to you Lama Chenrezig.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because the guru, in order to introduce you to the practice of Avalokiteśvara, must generate himself as well as vase and so on, in the form of Avalokiteśvara.

smcj said:

I pray to you Yidam Chenrezig

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because this the path the guru has introduced you to.

smcj said:

I pray to you Perfect Noble Chenrezig.

I pray to you Lord Protector Chenrezig

I pray to you Lord of Love Chenrezig
Great Compassionate Victor, please hold us with your compassion...please bestow the blessing to obtain omniscient Buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because Avalokiteśvara is a tenth stage bodhisattva, who is a being who has a separate continuum from you.

But for example, Hevajra was never a bodhisattva on the paths and stages, per se, there is no being with a separate continuum "Hevajra". The Hevajra mandala is a method taught by Vajradhara in the Hevajra Tantra to the tenth stage bodhisattva Vajragarbha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2016 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

Anders said:

To be honest, the emphasis I catch from this thread is very much of a 'po po if you take the deity to be real' in a way much stronger than you'd ever see for all our casual, but far less skilful, 'reals' like 'myself', 'my family', etc. If it's ok to treat those as conventionally real, surely the same rule applies to the deity in roughly similar measure?

Malcolm wrote:

No, a Yidam is not a sentient being possessing its own continuum. It is a method, that is all. People who do not understand this point, whether Tibetan or Western, do not understand Vajrayāna.

In other words, yidams exist as methods, but not as sentient beings. There is no external Kalacakra existing somewhere whom we petition for blessings when we do a Kalacakra sadhana.

M

smcj said:

Yidams are Sambhogakaya expressions of enlightenment.

Malcolm wrote:

If you mean a yidam is a method taught by the Sambhogakāya, sure, no problem.

The problem here, is that you are not properly distinguishing what is a method and what is not.

For example, when Buddha demonstrated to King Indrabhuti the Guhyasamaja Mandala,

that mandala display was being demonstrated as a method to Indrabhuti. It was not being displayed as some external being to whom Indrabhuti was supposed to make offerings and petition for blessings. It was being shown to Indrabhuti to illustrate the pure appearances of the aggregates, sense bases and sense elements of Indrabhuti's own continuum. The latter understood this, and attained Buddhahood on the spot, and in turn, taught the Guhyasamaja Mandala to his kingdom. This can be applied to all instances of the communication of yidam methods in the tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2016 at 7:59 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

Anders said:

To be honest, the emphasis I catch from this thread is very much of a 'po po if you take the deity to be real' in a way much stronger than you'd ever see for all our casual, but far less skilful, 'reals' like 'myself', 'my family', etc. If it's ok to treat those as conventionally real, surely the same rule applies to the deity in roughly similar measure?

Malcolm wrote:

No, a Yidam is not a sentient being possessing its own continuum. It is a method, that is all. People who do not understand this point, whether Tibetan or Western, do not understand Vajrayāna.

In other words, yidams exist as methods, but not as sentient beings. There is no external Kalacakra existing somewhere whom we petition for blessings when we do a Kalacakra sadhana.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2016 at 7:56 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

I assume you guys are hip to the fact that HHDL consults an oracle, right? That entails a man going into a trance and being possessed by some sort of spirit. It's not an enlightened deity, just some sort of spirit-thingy. The spirit gives HHDL cryptic predictions.

Malcolm wrote:

A worldly protector like the Nechung oracle (Dorje Dragden) is a sentient being continuing in samsara. Nechung is not a Yidam.

A transcendent protector like Mahākala is a sentient being who is beyond samsara. When you make offerings to him, you are making offerings to an external entity. Mahākala also has yidam practices.

But when you practice Mahākala as a yidam, in this case, one is not making offerings and so on to an external being, one is using Mahākala as a path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2016 at 10:55 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

haha said:

Nairatma is a deity; a method to recognize their own mind. But Yogeswor Virupa received empowerment and guidance from her.

Malcolm wrote:

The Nairatma from whom Virupa received teachings is clearly stated to have been a nirmanakāya, in other words, a human woman.

haha said:

The version have heard or read said that the Nairatma appeared in his dream.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, she appeared in his dream after he tossed his mala in the toilet, but he received empowerment and so on the following day from the nimanakaya Nairatma whom he met in person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 9th, 2016 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

conebeckham said:

Malcolm, if I recall, Kunzang Dechen Lingpa conversed directly with Padmasambhava. In dreams? Or in waking life?

Malcolm wrote:

Both. His communication with Padmasambhava was part of his own experiential vision. But he also was a person who was highly realized bodhisattva (IMO) on the paths and stages, and so his vision was not confined to the (impure) nirmanakāya level of perception, as is ours.

But if you ever told him his experience of Padmasambhava was real, he would have had

a good chuckle at that notion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2016 at 8:34 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

haha said:

Nairatma is a deity; a method to recognize their own mind. But Yogeswor Virupa received empowerment and guidance from her.

Malcolm wrote:

The Nairatma from whom Virupa received teachings is clearly stated to have been a nirmanakāya, in other words, a human woman.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2016 at 11:16 AM

Title: Re: Perdurabo - biography of Aleister Crowley

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I'm not really sure why you say that.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and I am afraid that you never will.

dzogchungpa said:

Jeez, what is this, Hate On Dzogchungpa Day?

Well, I like to read about stuff and if you were actually familiar with the fairly large number of memoirs available concerning Gurdjieff and his students, I doubt you would consider them to have been crashing bores. .

Malcolm wrote:

Virtually everyone is a crashing bore when you get right down to it.

dzogchungpa said:

Surely not the "awesome" Crowley.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, uncle Al had his moments, but if you have never read his autobiography, you really ought to -- he dictated it to his mistress while using extraordinary amounts of cocaine. It is really hilarious, ego-inflated, outrageous and generally entertaining.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2016 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

So let us go through it by the numbers with the guru, who is obviously a separate human being from us, and come to an understanding of how it can truly be said that one's mind is the guru. Then we can plug that definition back into the idea of a Yidam.

Malcolm wrote:

Yidams are not beings. They are a kind of method. That's all. That method must be received from a guru. If you don't receive a yidam from a guru, you cannot practice it at all.

Kelwin said:

And just to be completely clear, how do we reconcile that with their historical appearing?

Malcolm wrote:

I suggest you read some Tantras. Then you will understand perfectly the origin of this and that yidam. In short, Vajradhara taught these yidam practices as methods.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2016 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: Perdurabo - biography of Aleister Crowley

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I like to read about stuff and if you were actually familiar with the fairly large number of memoirs available concerning Gurdjieff and his students, I doubt you would consider them to have been crashing bores. .

Malcolm wrote:

Virtually everyone is a crashing bore when you get right down to it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2016 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: Perdurabo - biography of Aleister Crowley

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I'm not really sure why you say that.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and I am afraid that you never will.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2016 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

So let us go through it by the numbers with the guru, who is obviously a separate human being from us, and come to an understanding of how it can truly be said that one's mind is the guru. Then we can plug that definition back into the idea of a Yidam.

Malcolm wrote:

Yidams are not beings. They are a kind of method. That's all. That method must be received from a guru. If you don't receive a yidam from a guru, you cannot practice it at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2016 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

As a Shentongpa, I understand that the emptiness the deity arises from as being empty of anything other than Buddha Qualities.

Malcolm wrote:

And therefore, you invalidate the path...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 8th, 2016 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, who gives a flying f%#k what some Tibetan says.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I guess it would depend on the Tibetan.

Malcolm wrote:

It very much would, indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2016 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

The point of the completion stage is to eliminate the idea that the deity you imagine yourself as is real.

So since you don't think it's real before you start does that mean you don't need to do the completion stage?

Malcolm wrote:

The creation stage and completion stage, ideally, are merged from the start. However, to directly address your question, the issue is not real/unreal, the issue is impure/pure.

The creation stage exists to break attachment to impure appearances, that's all.

Nothing more. The completion exists to break attachments to pure appearances, nothing more.

Further, this is the point of starting out from emptiness. The deity arises from emptiness. That means even at the beginning of the practice you must realize the deity is unreal. If you do not realize from the start that the deity is unreal, the process of transforming your vision from impure to pure will never happen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2016 at 12:18 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimately, there is no deity, just as there is no person. All of these methods are just skillful means to cut clinging to impure appearances by training in pure appearances.

The point of the completion stage is to eliminate the idea that the deity you imagine yourself as is real. This is why you dissolve the deity into the state of emptiness at the end of a sadhana. Why? Impure appearances are not real and pure appearances are not real.

smcj said:

So therefore you conclude that you do not have to believe that the deity is present during practice. This is a classic example of why I've been saying that it is necessary to go ask a Tibetan. I don't think anything you just said, while technically correct, mitigates the need for faith and believing in the presence of a deity.--at all. Ultimately, there is no deity, just as there is no person

As I've said, the higher teachings can become a refuge from Dharma for the quasi-secular.

Flip that around: just as there is a person, there is a deity, which is exactly what Chime R. was quoted as saying: "Tara is as real as you are".

Hey, kick back and enjoy the show. Let people ask Tibetans like I said. Let's see if Tibetans say that there is no need to believe that the deity is present. Who knows, maybe some will agree with you?

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, who gives a flying f%#k what some Tibetan says.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2016 at 12:15 PM

Title: Re: Perdurabo - biography of Aleister Crowley

Content:

Wayfarer said:

There are plenty of counter-cultural figures I like and admire. I have even discovered a magician, John Michael Greer, a Druid, whom I think is really interesting and worth knowing about (blog <http://thearchdruidreport.blogspot.com.au>) . Always had a bit of time for Gurdjieff and Ouspensky (albeit no contact with the schools). But Crowley gives me the creeps. 'Beware the dark side, Luke'.

Malcolm wrote:

Gurdjieff was a lightweight. Crowley, despite his many flaws, actually understood yoga, Etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2016 at 5:45 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

What I believe is incorrect is:

Malcolm wrote:

You do not have to believe a deity is present — that is dualistic. You have to be the deity.

smcj said:

If no deity is present, there is nothing for you to become.

Malcolm wrote:

Ultimately, there is no deity, just as there is no person. All of these methods are just skillful means to cut clinging to impure appearances by training in pure appearances.

The point of the completion stage is to eliminate the idea that the deity you imagine yourself as is real. This is why you dissolve the deity into the state of emptiness at the end of a sadhana. Why? Impure appearances are not real and pure appearances are not real.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2016 at 5:41 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What makes you think that Tibetans did not import their own cultural prejudices and misinterpretations?

smcj said:

Because their culture has been saturated with Vajrayana for over a millennia.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you clearly have spent absolutely no time reading Vajrayāna polemics if you imagine there is some uniform, correct, vetted, curated, massaged, Tibetan view of Vajrayāna practice.

In fact, the different schools of Tibetan Buddhism disagree with each other over Vajrayāna practice even more than they disagree with each other over sūtra teachings like Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2016 at 5:15 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

...and then say, "So all that means that I don't have to believe that there is a deity actually present when I do sadhana, right?"

Malcolm wrote:

You do not have to believe a deity is present — that is dualistic. You have to be the deity.

Sadly, it is quite useless conversing with you, because you just misinterpret what everyone says and make really off the wall remarks.

smcj said:

The thrust of what I am saying is go to ask a Dharma question of an authority that lacks any possibility of corruption due to cultural prejudice and misinterpretation. At the very least that will encourage people to have active communication with the living tradition of Dharma. You should be joining me in encouraging people to do that.

Malcolm wrote:

What makes you think that Tibetans did not import their own cultural prejudices and

misinterpretations?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2016 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

...and then say, "So all that means that I don't have to believe that there is a deity actually present when I do sadhana, right?"

Malcolm wrote:

You do not have to believe a deity is present — that is dualistic. You have to be the deity.

Sadly, it is quite useless conversing with you, because you just misinterpret what everyone says and make really off the wall remarks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, August 7th, 2016 at 4:46 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

No. Tibetans have a different culture than we do. The way they hear and understand Dharma is different than what we hear. If you ask a Tibetan if the deities are real and you ask a Westerner if the deities are real, you will get two different answers. Since the topic at hand is how to understand the deities in the original context, the proper procedure is to ask an expert that has not corrupted the teachings with their quasi-secular interpretations that misapply the higher teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Lets see, who has corrupted what teachings with interpretation. Please be specific.

smcj said:

So I proudly say again, with absolutely no qualms about being accused of racism, that in order to get the correct answer people should ask a lama of Tibetan heritage so as to not get a corrupted answer.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, because other people who have practiced as long or longer don't know shit.

smcj said:

The simplest way I can think to ask the question is, "Should I believe that the dieiy is actually present when I do my sadhana practice?" Then when the answer is yes say,"But aren't they all the nature of emptiness? (Or non-duality, or provisional, or nature of my own mind, or whatever your favorite idea that discounts their nature might be) The answer will be yes. So then go back and say, "So therefore I do not have to believe they

are really present when I do my practice." Let me know what your Tibetan lama says.

Malcolm wrote:

When you do the sadhana, you are supposed to be the deity, it is not actually conceived as some external entity to which you are making an appeal. For example, when one makes offerings, prostrations and praises in a sadhana to whom is one making offerings, prostrations and praises? One is making offerings, prostrations and praises to oneself as the deity.

You arrogantly have elected yourself the defender of the tradition against what you perceive to be corrupting influences, but as far as I can tell, you have not actually understood the tradition you imagine you are defending.

smcj said:

...someone will have gone to the effort to have contact with the living tradition of the Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize that I am someone who was appointed by a real, live Tibetan to be an Ācarya within the Sakya school, and someone who was entitled Lama connected with a Nyingma monastery (Donak Tharling) by another, real live Tibetan? And yet, somehow you seek to cast aspersion on us all who actually made connections with the living tradition of Vajrayāna because we don't accept your very skewed ideas of what this tradition states.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2016 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

And, as far as this thread is concerned, I'd like to see the question posed to Tibetan lamas that were raised and trained in Tibet over the ones in India too.

dzogchungpa said:

I've heard Anam Thubten, who meets this criterion, address this question. His answer was a bit more subtle than what I've heard so far on DW.

Malcolm wrote:

Don't be a tease, do tell.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2016 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Ancient Chinese Flood

Content:
Nicholas Weeks said:
Evidence that it did happen, not just a legend:

<http://www.popularmechanics.com/science/environment/a22195/scientists-confirm-truth-ancient-chinese-flood/>

Malcolm wrote:
You are connecting this event to Noah's Ark?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2016 at 10:58 PM
Title: Re: Yidams
Content:
smcj said:
That's the reason why I say ask an Asian.

Malcolm wrote:
Your fan boyism for "Asian Lamas" is not charming, and it is pretty racist, actually.

smcj said:
Actually you are even worse. You not only specify Tibetan lamas as being superior, but Tibetans that are still in Tibet above the ones in India. And, as far as this thread is concerned, I'd like to see the question posed to Tibetan lamas that were raised and trained in Tibet over the ones in India too. But that is putting too far out of reach and it might be interpreted as avoiding getting an answer.

Malcolm wrote:
I think it is still the case that there are more realized Tibetans in Tibet than in India. For example, when is the last time you ever heard of a rainbow body in India? (Answer: never).

But my point, simply put, it this: there is nothing magical about Tibetans educated in the monasteries that renders their understanding of the two stages and so on necessarily superior to the understanding of the same among say, Chinese, American or Europeans. It really depends on the person. I have met many "Lamas" who are quite ignorant of the principles behind the rituals they practice. When I say your point of view is racist it is because unwittingly you are invoking the trope of the "Asian sage."

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2016 at 10:38 PM
Title: Re: Yidams
Content:
smcj said:
That's the reason why I say ask an Asian.

Malcolm wrote:

Your fan boyism for "Asian Lamas" is not charming, and it is pretty racist, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2016 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Perdurabo - biography of Aleister Crowley

Content:

Wayfarer said:

Why would a Buddhist admire a satanist?

Malcolm wrote:

He was a very interesting person. Definitely not a saint, but who needs saints? Saints are boring.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2016 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

But in any case ask an Asian lama. Make sure they understand you don't accept that the deities are actually present when you practice. See what they say.

Malcolm wrote:

You seem, erroneously, to think that merely because one understands that in the process of the creation stage yidams are conceptual, mental constructs (which are generated and dismantled), that this also means one thinks that there are no sentient beings who, relatively speaking, mounted the paths and stages, no beings that swore themselves to the protection of Dharma and so on, no beings that taught methods of the two stages, etc.

It is your failure to make this distinction yourself that is the root of your confusion and the reason why you keep making up faults in others where none exist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2016 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

A while ago I introduced the idea of Shentong here at DW...

Malcolm wrote:

You flatter yourself, and it isn't true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2016 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: Perdurabo - biography of Aleister Crowley

Content:

MiphamFan said:

His reputation as a "black" magician is vastly overstated, partly because he himself loved the notoriety and also because cultural Christianity was stronger then. His magic is no more or less objectionable than that of different tirthika tantras.

Malcolm wrote:

Crowley was awesome.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2016 at 6:21 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

No doubt due to the intense, rather public, squabbling of a certain group of dimwits.

Malcolm wrote:

Specifically one dimwit who took the Maharshi epithet as ChNN's endorsement of the same.

dzogchungpa said:

Which one was that?

Malcolm wrote:

Mustang Cave...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2016 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Oh, that! But that book is not a presentation of Rinpoche's teachings. Furthermore the offending material was not "slipped in" to anything but rather was chosen as an epigraph for the book by one of the translators...

Malcolm wrote:

And withdrawn in the next edition...

dzogchungpa said:

No doubt due to the intense, rather public, squabbling of a certain group of dimwits.

Malcolm wrote:

Specifically one dimwit who took the Maharshi epithet as ChNN's endorsement of the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2016 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Is Tobacco an obstacle to practice?

Content:

Sādhaka said:

There's a story about a Lama who took a student's cigarette, took a drag, and blew smoke from his skin pores, and then said (paraphrased) 'When you can do this, then you can smoke without any problems'.

Malcolm wrote:

It was Dudjom Lingpa, and he used tobacco regularly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2016 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

JinpaRangdrol said:

I just don't think poo-pooing the idea of not killing, etc., simply because it can be viewed as a "vow," is actually productive.

Malcolm wrote:

The point I am addressing, and it is a very normative view in Buddhism, is that taking vows makes our virtue more virtuous. But this is actually quite silly if you really put on your thinking cap.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2016 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

When was that?

florin said:

The marvelous primordial state.

dzogchungpa said:

Oh, that! But that book is not a presentation of Rinpoche's teachings. Furthermore the offending material was not "slipped in" to anything but rather was chosen as an epigraph for the book by one of the translators...

Malcolm wrote:

And withdrawn in the next edition...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, August 6th, 2016 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

JinpaRangdrol said:

But the first three are pretty indispensable, and I'd be highly skeptical of any Buddhist who saw refraining from killing, stealing, and lying (even without officially holding vows against them) as erroneous behaviors.

Malcolm wrote:

He does not kill, he does not steal, and he does not lie. So for what reason does he need vows to refrain from these actions?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2016 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: family line versus reincarnation

Content:

Jeff H said:

Materiality cannot arise from consciousness and consciousness cannot arise from materiality...

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, Vasubandhu maintains that matter arises from consciousness, and this is a standard position in Buddhadharma from Sautrantika all the way to Dzogchen.

Jeff H said:

I appreciate the correction, but I thought that was just a Cittamatrā view. Perhaps I am over-interpolating what Geshe Tashi Tsering wrote:

Geshe Tashi said:

There is a very close connection between mind and body. But there is no way one can replace the other or be transformed into the other. Mind cannot become material and material cannot become mind. Mind is mere experience, nothing more, and experience is not the same as brain function. There is nothing physical about it at all. It is supported by the physical – the eye consciousness is supported by our physical eye and the nerves etc. – but the mind itself is mere clarity and knowing. No more than that. This is a very important point.

Jeff H said:

I think you're saying that even though mind is completely non-material and matter is completely non-experiential, so that they cannot transform into one another, nevertheless matter originally arose from consciousness.

Assuming I got that specific point wrong, does it negate my general point, that family lineage is derived from a process of physical causality and rebirth refers to the karmic process of mental causality? In other words, birth is the merging of these two different processes, and rebirth refers to the continuity of mental moments being re-associated with different forms.

Malcolm wrote:

It is very simple. From consciousness arises space; from space, air; from air, fire; from fire, water; and from water, earth.

The reality of it is the consciousness and matter are completely inseparable. This substance dualism that some Western Buddhists latch onto is not at all the intention of the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2016 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

The lama HHK 16 assigned to our center told me that from the time he was a toddler his parents told him that the 3 Jewels would never fail him. So according to you his parents ruined him as a practitioner!

As an example of his faith, here's a story. He went on retreat in 1948, well before there were problems. The first he knew that there was something wrong was when the Chinese attacked his monastery. He broke down his cell door to find explosions, gunfire, flames, screams and death. So after 11 years of retreat, with no riot warning whatsoever of an immanent life and death crisis, how did he react? Did he take the Mahamudra approach and say, "It's all mind"? No. He said to himself "The 3 Jewels will not fail me" and took off running. No provisions, no planning, just faith and his feet.

I get one story from the teachers of my lineage and a different story from you.
Hmmm....

Malcolm wrote:

What about all the people murdered by the Chinese who also took refuge in the Three Jewels? No higher power helped them. And no higher power helped your lama friend. He escaped because he had two legs and luck.

smcj said:

The way to have direct experience is to work with a guru from whom one can receive

direct introduction. That's the point.

Well, yes, if that's appropriate for your karma. However very few people are karmically ripe enough for that to work. That is true even if they have access to an authentic Dzogchen master.

Malcolm wrote:

It may be the case that not everyone has the karma to meet Dzogchen teachings, that I can accept. But, every person who has the karma to meet Dzogchen teachings and is interested enough to pursue them has the capacity for them — which is proven by their interest in them to begin with. In Dzogchen teachings we do not make a distinction between sharp and dull in faculties.

smcj said:

That is why Ati is normally taught by most Dzogchen teachers as the 9th yana.

Malcolm wrote:

Ati (the path of self-liberation) is taught as a ninth vehicle to contrast it with the vehicles of cause (paths of renunciation) and result (paths of transformation), not because it is the result of a gradual progression through the nine yānas. However, this is a common misunderstanding even promulgated widely in the Nyingma school.

cone said:

Two Stages are somehow "lesser."

Basically, the position of ancient Dzogchen masters in India such as Śrī Siṃha is that the creation stage is unnecessary.

Would it be accurate to say that this position is something of an outlier?

Malcolm wrote:

Śrī Siṃha was the Dzogchen guru of Padmasambhava, Vairocana and Vimalamitra. So, I think we can say with certainty that this is the normative position of Dzogchen teachings. As I mentioned before, it is not the case that it is impossible to realize Dzogchen through deity practice, as Mañjuśrīmitra notes, however, deity yoga is not necessary on the Dzogchen path, and moreover, as Padmasambhava states in the Khandro Nyingthig, developing a detailed samadhi of a deity is completely unnecessary. It is sufficient to merely think you are the deity, that's it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2016 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: family line versus reincarnation

Content:

Jeff H said:

Materiality cannot arise from consciousness and consciousness cannot arise from materiality...

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, Vasubandhu maintains that matter arises from consciousness, and this is a standard position in Buddhadharma from Sautrantika all the way to Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2016 at 7:30 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

It's a lot simpler than that.

Basically Malcolm (and a few others) don't like or accept anything like a "higher power" or the idea of faith.

Malcolm wrote:

Faith is fine; but you are right, I think the idea of a "higher power" is horse shit. It does not belong in Buddhadharma. Buddhahood is not given from outside, it is discovered inside.

There are three kinds of faith. I don't accept the kind of blind faith you advocate, and no practitioner should.

smcj said:

The way to transition from outer to inner to direct experience requires faith. That's the point.

Malcolm wrote:

The way to have direct experience is to work with a guru from whom one can receive direct introduction. That's the point.

cone said:

Two Stages are somehow "lesser."

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, the position of ancient Dzogchen masters in India such as Śrī Siṃha is that the creation stage is unnecessary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2016 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

Nothing is accepted as definitive by everybody, not even Dzogchen view.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. On the other hand, people who do not understand Dzogchen teachings will not consider them definitive. Meanwhile, everyone who does, does.

dzogchungpa said:

It must be really great to understand Dzogchen teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2016 at 4:24 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

However the Uttaratantra is considered definitive.

Malcolm wrote:

By some, not by others And definitely it is not definitive with respect to Dzogchen teachings.

smcj said:

Nothing is accepted as definitive by everybody, not even Dzogchen view.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. On the other hand, people who do not understand Dzogchen teachings will not consider them definitive. Meanwhile, everyone who does, does.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2016 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

The Uttaratantra says that the Buddha Activity is ceaseless, and that it is only our karmic limitations that do not allow us to see it.

Malcolm wrote:

And from a relative [deluded] point of view, this is all fine.

smcj said:

However the Uttaratantra is considered definitive.

Malcolm wrote:

By some, not by others And definitely it is not definitive with respect to Dzogchen

teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2016 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

Kelwin said:

To what degree then does the relative cease to exist, when we realise the absolute?

Malcolm wrote:

If the relative ceased to exist, this would be annihilationism. If the relative arose, this would be eternalism. As the Guhyagarbha Tantra states:

E ma ho, what an amazing wonderful Dharma!

The secret of all perfect buddhas
is that everything arises from nonarising,
when it arose it did not arise.

Kelwin said:

Right, so what is the problem with divine beings teaching compassion or pointing out the absolute? Or, blessing our practice for that matter?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing wrong with it at all, as long as you understand it is all a delusion, a mistaken perception.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2016 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

The Uttaratantra says that the Buddha Activity is ceaseless, and that it is only our karmic limitations that do not allow us to see it.

Malcolm wrote:

And from a relative [deluded] point of view, this is all fine.

Kelwin said:

To what degree then does the relative cease to exist, when we realise the absolute?

Malcolm wrote:

If the relative ceased to exist, this would be annihilationism. If the relative arose, this would be eternalism. As the Guhyagarbha Tantra states:

E ma ho, what an amazing wonderful Dharma!

The secret of all perfect buddhas
is that everything arises from nonarising,

it did not arise when it arose.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, August 5th, 2016 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And who wrote the preface?

dzogchungpa said:

Now, now guys, there's no need to make an Aunt Sally of poor smcj.

Since ChNN and Tara have come up, I thought you all might enjoy reading this passage from his preface to "Guru Arya Tara and Her Twenty-One Praises": Across cultures and eras in this human experience, we have sensed the existence of a force or fundamental energy that we have come to represent in the form of various female divinities. The ancient people of Shang Shung, for example, recognised this energy by the name Namchi Kungyal, the Grandmother or Ancestor Queen of Heaven. The central female divinity in the pre-Buddhist Bon pantheon, Loving Mother or Chamma, is very similar to Arya Tara in the Buddhist tradition. The American Indians and Australian Aborigines still call this force Mother Earth; the ancient Greeks called it Athena and the ancient Egyptians Great Mother.

The external forms embodying this divine energy are just as diverse as the names and characteristics attributed to it in cultures throughout time. While some populations, such as American Indians and Australian Aborigines, have maintained their ancient traditions throughout processes of change and evolution, others have modified or substituted their ancient religious systems, identifying the essence of this force or energy with a saint or divinity.

One of the most widely known personifications of this maternal and generative energy is found in the Christian tradition, venerated in the form of Mary, considered the Mother of Christ and later called Our Lady or the Madonna, particularly in Latin countries.

The cult of St. Sophia is a good example of the evolution of an ancient religious system. In ancient Greece, sophia, wisdom, was initially one of the chief attributes of the goddess Athena. Later, this quality was personified in a female saint by the same name. The ancient tradition also personified wisdom in female form, for example in the Mahayana, with Yum Chenmo, the Great Mother, the source of all the tathagatas or buddhas.

...

Whether we consider her a goddess, saint, or buddha, and by whatever name we call her, the Great Mother is the compassionate wisdom that nurtures us on the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2016 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

Malcolm doesn't buy that.

Malcolm wrote:

Neither does Mipham:

Because the awakening of the sugata does not exist, his magical apparition, while a false appearance, appears to the deluded, similar to an illusion.

And the Buddha states in the PP Sūtra in 8,000 lines, etc:

Son of a good family, the tathāgatas neither come nor go. Son of a good family, for example, an illusory group of elephants, group of horses, group of chariots, or group of soldiers neither come nor go. Son of a good family, the kāya of the tathāgata also neither comes nor goes.

Son of a good family, for example, a person who has gone to sleep sees one, two, three, four, five, ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty tathāgatas or more in his dream; but when he awakes from sleep he does not even see one tathāgata.

Son of a good family, what do you think? From where do those tathāgatas come? To where do they go? Sadaprarudita, son of a good family, the phenomena in a dream are not established. Dreams are false, they are not real.

If the previous two statements are understood properly, one will understand all the key points of creation and completion stage. In other words, creation stage is the dream, waking is the completion stage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2016 at 10:39 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism and bon

Content:

philji said:

If one has taken refuge in three jewels, is it breaking one's refuge vow to practice teachings within Bon, such as given online by Tenzin WNgal Rinpoche which may be useful for healing?

Malcolm wrote:

Many sectarian lamas will say so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2016 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

You advocate that we should not make up our own version of Dharma. Since HHST is the head of your sect, and your view is not compatible with his, you might want to reconsider your opinions on this matter.

Malcolm wrote:

I am certain my point of view is compatible both with HHST and ChNN, despite whatever conciliatory things they say to those who are transitioning to Buddhadharma and have unresolved doubts.

Second, I don't belong to a school, not Sakya, not Nyingma, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2016 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

Regardless of the semantics (and I'd like to point out how the focus here has been on the offensive word with its root of "theism"), HHST is clearly affirming that that "a divine compassion or a divine wisdom, manifest in the form of a deity" is part of the tradition. However you want to characterize that, with or without an English word with a root of "theism", that idea is part of Buddhadharma. He is not ambiguous about the idea at all.

Malcolm wrote:

God isn't anything at all since it does not exist (like the son of a barren women, etc.). As I said, these kinds of statements are for the benefit of ex-theists like yourself who are struggling with absence of God in Buddhadharma.

You wonder about my background: I was not raised in any religion, was never baptized, and my parents are confirmed atheists. I have only been to a Christian service three time in my life, all as an adult: High Episcopalian Xmas masses twice, and a Congregationalist service.

I remain bewildered at why people need such a concept in their lives. And since there is no concept in any traditional Buddhadharma text, I really fail to see why it is so hard to understand that HHST and ChNN are attempting to speak to those people from theistic backgrounds.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2016 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

I guess these guys don't understand their traditions either. They need to join DW so that they can get straightened out.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you are the one who needs straightening out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2016 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

I am discussing what is taught by the tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

You are discussing your impressions of some tradition you think you understand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2016 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

The Uttaratantra says that the Buddha Activity is ceaseless, and that it is only our karmic limitations that do not allow us to see it.

Malcolm wrote:

And from a relative [deluded] point of view, this is all fine.

smcj said:

I do have an antipathy towards the importation of theism into our religion.

Ah yes, the old bugaboo "theism". And the reason for that antipathy would be because...?

Malcolm wrote:

It does not belong in Buddhadharma. It is an outsider tenet.

smcj said:

And if so, why did you not use your editorial discretion and correct HHST's quotation in that book? Is it because you would have had to communicate that decision to him and you knew it would not fly?

Malcolm wrote:

I contributed to Treasures of the Sakya Lineage, but I did not edit it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2016 at 7:38 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

But compassion and wisdom in Buddhadharma does not come from a god. It flows out of the empathy and understanding of human beings, and is perfected in the case of a buddha.

Uh huh. And once someone becomes a Buddha does all that go to waste? Or is a Buddha actually able to benefit beings? After all, the entire point in becoming a Buddha is to benefit others.

Malcolm wrote:

As Garab Dorje's disciple, Mañjuśrimitra wrote:

Because the awakening of the sugata does not exist, his magical apparitions appear to the deluded, similar to an illusion.

In other words, the appearance of a buddha working for the benefit of sentient beings is delusion from our side.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2016 at 7:35 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

However Malcolm spins this to mean: There is no divine compassion or wisdom apart from the nature of the mind.

Which is quasi-secular.

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing secular, quasi or otherwise, about my statement.

smcj said:

It is an importation of an antipathy towards religion learned from our culture, and not found in Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

I am have no antipathy towards religion, I belong to one (Buddhism, nominally speaking). I do have an antipathy towards the importation of theism into our religion.

And by the way, there were and are plenty of Tibetans who did not and do not give a shit about Dharma. Your continued insistence that Tibetans are all devout Buddhists is just Shangrilaism, or a species of orientalism ala Said.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2016 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Queequeg said:

All Trump had to do was go after Clinton for the next 90 some odd days...

Malcolm wrote:

And all Clinton has to do is keep trotting out surrogates to bait him into responding like the ass he truly is and walla:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2016 at 4:27 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

chimechodra said:

I don't think what Malcolm is doing here is "spinning the teachings to be quasi-secular" in any way...

Malcolm wrote:

Of course not. There is nothing secular about rebirth, karma, samsara, the three kāyas, rainbow bodies, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2016 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

smcj said:

Headlines read that the GOP wants to do an intervention. Swell. Suppose he wins, then what? Are they going to be doing interventions during an international crisis when he's POTUS?

The GOP source insisted that there was no real movement yet to prepare for Trump exiting the race -- a step that would be unprecedented in modern politics. But the source also noted that if the billionaire did quit before September 1, it would be theoretically possible for the GOP to come up with a nominee who could get on the ballot in enough states to reach the 270 electoral votes needed to win the presidency.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.cnn.com/2016/08/03/politics/donald-trump-campaign-disarray/>

You just can't make this stuff up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2016 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, with all due respect, you are quite far from being my main source of information in this area.

Malcolm wrote:

With all due respect, who cares?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2016 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

As I said earlier in this thread, the problem of the higher teachings taken out of context of the lower teachings is that they can be spun to be quasi-secular.

dzogchungpa said:

I think I understand your concern. What's wanted is a kind of "religionless religion", a phrase which btw appears to have been coined by Rajneesh.

Online, people often err on the religionless side but in practice, I don't think it's much of a problem.

Malcolm wrote:

I am pretty happy with the religion the Buddhas taught (——>afflictions——> karma ——> suffering ——>). What I am not interested in is Western attempts to recast Buddhadharma as a theism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2016 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The usage "to impute upon" is many centuries old, and is found in the works of Samuel Coleridge, etc.

Matibhadra said:

A falsary does not like to be caught, let alone exposed, right?

By the way, spending a lot of time out there in Texas searching for my profiles on scholarly websites?

Anyway, please keep visiting my humble blog, and drop a comment there once in a while! One day if I have time I'll publish our old long '98 debate where your clumsy views were thoroughly defeated, whence your nocturnal panic attacks ever since!

Malcolm wrote:

I don't live in Texas, nor do I ever spend time searching profiles, or for that matter, visit your blog. I have no interest in ghost cultists like you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, August 4th, 2016 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

HHST said:

If, however, God is something else, a divine compassion or a divine wisdom, manifest in the form of a deity, you might say that Buddhism is not atheistic but polytheistic."

smcj said:

vs.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no divine compassion or wisdom apart from the nature of the mind

smcj said:

The two statements are not compatible.

dzogchungpa said:

As ChNN says: God always exists as our real nature, the base, for everybody. and 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?

Malcolm wrote:

Again, ChNN is just being kind to those people who are still addicted to divine anything.

He also said:

The very meaning of the Tibetan term Dzogchen, "Great Perfection," refers to the true primordial state of every individual and not to any transcendent reality.

"Divine" means "of, from, or like God or a god..."

But compassion and wisdom in Buddhadharma does not come from a god. It flows out of the empathy and understanding of human beings, and is perfected in the case of a buddha.

Just in case you forgot, of the six kinds of beings in the six realms, only human beings are capable of buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2016 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<https://twitter.com/jesselehrich/status/760806897524015105>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2016 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Buddha Boy - Ram Bahadur Bomjon

Content:

Simon E. said:

It would be a bit of a stretch to believe that all the reports of rape, beatings, chainings, illegal imprisonments and the mysterious disappearance of large sums of money with which this man and his cronies are directly associated, are all slanderous and fictional.

Nicholas Weeks said:

Those were not 'cronies' but supposed devotees who took the donations for their own use. They were eventually found out and booted out of the ashram.

[Your posts are doubling]

By the bye, I wrote the Office of HHDL to see if he or any respected Bhikshu has met the young sage and gathered an impression, good or bad.

Malcolm wrote:

He used to be a student at the Sakya Center in Derha Dun. No one takes him seriously outside of his Nepalese devotees, and a few misguided westerners, the same kind of people who follow Benjamin Creme or that Mt. Shasta "Buddha Maitreya."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2016 at 10:01 PM

Title: Elinor Ostrum's Victory of the Commons

Content:

Unknown said:

The biggest roadblock standing in the way of many people's recognition of the importance of the commons came tumbling down when Indiana University professor Elinor Ostrom won the Nobel Prize for Economics.

Over many decades, Ostrom has documented how various communities manage common resources—grazing lands, forests, irrigation waters, fisheries—equitably and sustainably over the long term. The Nobel Committee's recognition of her work effectively debunks popular theories about the Tragedy of the Commons, which hold that private property is the only effective method to prevent finite resources from being ruined or depleted.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.yesmagazine.org/new-economy/the-victory-of-the-commons>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2016 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

Some months ago there was a thread where HHST was quoted as saying that Vajrayana was polytheistic. I guess he thinks the Yidams are deities.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he was saying that Buddhism recognizes the existence of such deities as Brahma, and so on. It has nothing to do with "Yidams" per se.

smcj said:

The quote in question:

Q. Buddhism is sometimes said to be atheistic because it holds that there is no God.

HHST: Buddhism does not believe in a God as the creator of the world, and in that sense, you might say it is atheistic. If, however, God is something else, a divine compassion or a divine wisdom, manifest in the form of a deity, you might say that Buddhism is not atheistic but polytheistic."

Malcolm wrote:

I do not think this use of "polytheism" is very precise. On the other hand, he is trying to help theists (like you) get a handle on the multiplicity of buddhas in Buddhadharma—so it is forgivable, despite being a stretch.

Buddhism is only a polytheism in the sense that it recognizes the existence of the polytheistic pantheon of ancient India.

If we "worship" iṣṭa-devatas, yidams, as external beings, then our practice becomes Nonbuddhist. Rather than being an insider practice, it becomes an outsider practice. One might object and claim, "In Kriya tantra we are instructed to visualize the deity like a minister petitioning a king, therefore this is a kind of external practice." In reply, while it is true that in Kriya tantra, we generate the deity before us while remaining in our ordinary form, the point is that we are "generating" the deity. This is something we are visualizing, so therefore, even though it may seem externally directed, unlike Vedic practice (where one worships mundane, external sentient beings such as Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva), there is nothing to be found which is not a product of one's own minds.

There is no divine compassion or wisdom apart from the nature of the mind. People who realize that nature of the mind fully are buddhas. People who have partially realized that are called "bodhisattvas." People who aspire to realize that are called "practitioners." People who have no interest in that at all are called "ordinary sentient beings."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2016 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

So no, I don't agree with you on this.

Malcolm wrote:

Because, as usual, you don't really know what you are talking about.

smcj said:

As I have always maintained, I am a lower yana practitioner. As such I think my view is dharmically correct. It is how my teachers have taught me. It is not incorrect of me to repeat it here.

Malcolm wrote:

No one teaches that the jñānasattva is in fact some relative entity (much less an ultimate entity) that can be summoned with a mudra and a mantra from "over there" to "over here."

The summing and absorption of the jñānasattva is an empowerment drama (recapitulated in daily sadhana practice), meant to symbolize the fact that while we have never been separate from the nature of the mind, we have not seen it up till now, and so therefore, the summoning of the jñānasattva is meant to dramatically emphasize this fact and bring it to our attention.

And in lower tantras, the jñānasattva is dismissed "to its natural abode," which is why, among other reasons, that lower tantra is lower. And of course the meaning of this is that in post-equipoise, one readopts one's ordinary form, because now the mandala "drama" in your daily practice is finished. In higher tantra, of course, one is supposed to maintain the dramatic person of the yidam throughout all activities until it no longer feels like a dramatic persona, but instead, one really feels that one is the deity.

There is no deity apart from the nature of one's mind. If someone thinks there is a deity apart from the nature of the mind, they have understood nothing at all about the creation stage, let alone the completion stage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2016 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

Some months ago there was a thread where HHST was quoted as saying that Vajrayana was polytheistic. I guess he thinks the Yidams are deities.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he was saying that Buddhism recognizes the existence of such deities as Brahma, and so on. It has nothing to do with "Yidams" per se.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2016 at 10:17 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Matibhadra said:

Since the phrase 'imputed upon' does not exist in English...

Malcolm wrote:

This shows you have read very little English, Lobzang.

Matibhadra said:

Or, more likely, that you thought very little about the much you think you have read.

Malcolm wrote:

The usage "to impute upon" is many centuries old, and is found in the works of Samuel Coleridge, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2016 at 6:03 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

Norwegian said:

" You must understand that the invocation, and so on, enable you to recall the primordial indivisibility of the samaya and wisdom beings; it is not as though you are placing one into the other. " -- Jigme Lingpa

tomamundsen said:

Even if it's ultimately a misconception, the Mahayaogatantra technique involves a union. Not sure what the Sarma equivalent name for that is. But basically, this is applying a Dzogchen view to the technique, which may not be accepted by all tantric practitioners.

conebeckham said:

Anuttarayogatantra.

The Jnanasattva/Samayasattva is a common element of sadhanas for this class in Sarma. But the sadhanas also include various other methods of development-- including instantaneous recollection, and a variety of levels of "building up" and "taking down" the "supporting" and "Supported."

Another interesting difference, in general terms, between Kye Rim in Nyingma and Sarma sadhanas involves whether the Dak Kye and Dun Kye (Self- and front-visualizations) arise simultaneously or whether successive stages of the sadhana focus on one or the other....

I've also been interested in these differences. Perhaps this isn't the place to discuss the finer points, though...

Malcolm wrote:

Cakrasamvara defines different methods of creation based on the kind of birth they are supposed to purify (there are four methods for the four kinds of birth). Thus even instant creation in Sarma does not have the same view as Anuyoga, since there is still a samayasattva/jñānasattva duality, which is characteristic of mahāyoga on down.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2016 at 6:01 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

Fa Dao said:

ok then..so how does this process work (samayasattva and jñanasattva) when you are doing it Anuyoga?

Malcolm wrote:

Anuyoga recognizes that the two sattvas have always been inseparable, thus obviating the need to summon the jñānasattva and absorb it (the entire process of which is a mental fabrication).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2016 at 6:00 AM

Title: Re: Yidams

Content:

smcj said:

So no, I don't agree with you on this.

Malcolm wrote:

Because, as usual, you don't really know what you are talking about.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2016 at 5:57 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Please guys, don't confuse vinegar with facts.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Why? because simply not eating meat in no way, shape or form guarantees a healthy diet

treehuggingoctopus said:

How true it is. My wife has been recovering for three years now from her seven-year-long vegetarian adventure. The doctors are shaking their heads. The correlation between health/longevity and vegetarianism might be easily explained, though. If my experience is significant here in any way -- and it may be and it may not be -- many if not most of those who become vegetarians are first world people coming from upper middle/upper class families. They can afford to take care of their health properly, and usually enjoy a properly balanced vegetarian diet.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Yep, precisely. Most vegetarians (the ones that go that way by choice, in western countries at least) come from an economic background where they have access to higher quality foods, and are more likely to at least sometimes eat fresh vegetables, due to having thought more about food than your average person.. fresh vegetables being a likely cornerstone of most healthy diets minus rare people's who have certain subsistence diets etc.

So of course being vegetarian can be very healthy, like the whole rest of the conversation, it's all about context. Talking about diet, it's also IMO the height of silliness to pretend there is only one "healthy diet" that follows strict rules, any unbiased study of nutrition you can see that this is not so, and that there is likely a range of healthy diets for human beings. But..people gonna' cherry pick to make their case, and 90% of the "studies" and mainstream claims out there about diet aren't worth squat without consulting with someone who has the education and experience to make sense of them - IME.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2016 at 5:56 AM

Title: Re: Buddha Boy - Ram Bahadur Bomjon

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Looks like a new USA website that is better organized than the Nepal one. Also noticed mainly Eastern faces among his new monks, perhaps they have met a good knowing advisor - hope so. Not clear if they were bhikshus before or laymen?

<http://us.bsds.maitriya.info>

Malcolm wrote:
Great, new cult in the offing...

Nicholas Weeks said:
Any evidence? or just suspicious?

Malcolm wrote:
Open your eyes, and all will be revealed to you.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2016 at 5:53 AM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3
Content:
DGA said:

Dr. Jill Stein stuck her foot in her mouth over the weekend trying to court the whackaloon anti-vaccine vote. She's walked that back now but it's enough for me to question her judgment as a tactician. What could possibly be gained by courting members of a movement whose peculiar fantasies have the consequence of maiming and killing children? Why taint yourself by flirting with the nuts when the overwhelming majority are allergic?

<http://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2016/08/an-anti-vaxer-in-the-white-house/493916/>

Malcolm wrote:
Its a hit piece, and untrue.

DGA said:
The Washington Post piece that started the kerfuffle was. The Atlantic article linked above is neither a hit piece, nor untrue.

I still intend to vote for her, but...

Malcolm wrote:
Yeah, it is since she is not an anti-vaxxer. Her concern, rather, is the process by which vaccines are approved for the public. A concern I agree with.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2016 at 3:41 AM
Title: Re: Yidams
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Both the samayasattva and the jñānasattva are fabrications. If it is visualized, it is

fabricated. Period. This is fine, but just be clear what you are doing (and what you are talking about).

Tirisilex said:

I don't see how a Yidam can have any power if it doesn't exist. If it's just a fabrication of my mind then how does it have any power to fix my mind? I mean how can a delusion fix a delusion?

smcj said:

When you actually do a Yidam meditation the first step is to create a contrived mental image of the deity. That is nothing more than your own mental fabrication, called the Samayasattva. If that were all that there is to it, it could not help you. Your question shows you understand that much.

It is the next step that makes the meditation efficacious. Typically you imagine lights streaming out from you fabricated mental image which invite the "real" Yidam, called the Jhanasattva, to come from wherever they are in the universe and merge with your Samayasattva. The Jhanasattva is NOT a fabrication. Whether you consider it a being, or a radiant expression of enlightenment, or whatever, it is exactly the thing that can fix your mind. And the more faith you have the better it works.

My shorthand is that they are real, with the proviso that their true mode of being is beyond our imagination. It is our limited idea about what "real" means that is being denied, not the validity of the deity.

I hope that helps.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2016 at 3:06 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

vinegar said:

And spending an extra three to five years congratulating oneself on being pure doesn't sound too appealing to me.

Actually, on avg an extra 15 years of life. That's quality life too, unlike people who eat saturated fat and cholesterol.

Malcolm wrote:

This statistic is a fantasy stat.

vinegar said:

"Available evidence from randomized controlled trials shows that replacement of saturated fat with linoleic acid effectively lowers serum cholesterol but does not

support the hypothesis that this translates to a lower risk of death from coronary heart disease or all causes. Findings from the Minnesota Coronary Experiment add to growing evidence that incomplete publication has contributed to overestimation of the benefits of replacing saturated fat with vegetable oils rich in linoleic acid."

Malcolm wrote:

And:

Only a handful of randomized controlled trials have ever causally tested the traditional diet-heart hypothesis. The results for two of these trials were not fully reported. Our recovery and 2013 publication of previously unpublished data from the Sydney Diet Heart Study (SDHS, 1966-73) belatedly showed that replacement of saturated fat with vegetable oil rich in linoleic acid significantly increased the risks of death from coronary heart disease and all causes, despite lowering serum cholesterol.¹⁴ Our recovery of unpublished documents and raw data from another diet-heart trial, the Minnesota Coronary Experiment, provided us with an opportunity to further evaluate this issue.
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4836695/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2016 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Matibhadra said:

Since the phrase 'imputed upon' does not exist in English...

Malcolm wrote:

This shows you have read very little English, Lobzang.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, August 3rd, 2016 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: Buddha Boy - Ram Bahadur Bomjon

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Looks like a new USA website that is better organized than the Nepal one. Also noticed mainly Eastern faces among his new monks, perhaps they have met a good knowing advisor - hope so. Not clear if they were bhikshus before or laymen?

<http://us.bsds.maitriya.info>

Malcolm wrote:

Great, new cult in the offing...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 2nd, 2016 at 9:21 PM
Title: Re: Buddha Boy - Ram Bahadur Bomjon
Content:
Tilopa said:
He's highly regarded as a Buddhist teacher.

Malcolm wrote:
By whom? Can you name anyone?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 2nd, 2016 at 7:24 PM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3
Content:
DGA said:
Dr. Jill Stein stuck her foot in her mouth over the weekend trying to court the whackaloon anti-vaccine vote. She's walked that back now but it's enough for me to question her judgment as a tactician. What could possibly be gained by courting members of a movement whose peculiar fantasies have the consequence of maiming and killing children? Why taint yourself by flirting with the nuts when the overwhelming majority are allergic?

<http://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2016/08/an-anti-vaxer-in-the-white-house/493916/>

Malcolm wrote:
Its a hit piece, and untrue.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 2nd, 2016 at 10:27 AM
Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
No, the documentation illustrates that is suicidal to eat an American diet.

vinegar said:
Well, depends how much saturated fat and cholesterol you eat, and how little whole-plants and fiber you eat

In the vietnam era 1000s of young adults were autopsied and 80% were found to have onset of heart disease
Now, its 100% of young adults. Additionally, its now also 100% of 10 year olds. Even babies these days are being born with early onset out of the womb.

This is compared to certain countries where their populations live long lives, 10000 of

them were autopsied and only 1 had a minor trace of heart disease.

Malcolm wrote:

HFC + Antibiotics (in meat) + hormones + early onset of heart disease

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 2nd, 2016 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I never knew bacon could give you lung cancer, or that some people ate cigarettes, amazing!

vinegar said:

It was linking their increase risk in producing their respective cancers. So 100g of bacon to produce colorectal cancer carries the same increase in risk as smoking 7 cigarettes in producing developing lung/throat cancer.

I've been studying nutrition almost 4yrs now, only in the last 6 months did we get to animal products vs whole-plants. In the end the past 3 months I went 100% whole-plant, not for the animals, but for myself. All the documentation illustrates that its suicidal to eat animal products. Heavily documented.

Though the thought "i'm not willing to kill a cow myself, but i am willing to pay someone to have done it" was really starting to grate on me as i continued to reflect on it

Malcolm wrote:

No, the documentation illustrates that is suicidal to eat an American diet.

So, in bacon, what is actually the carcinogen? Mainly the sodium nitrites + the method of cooking + amount. Processed meats are the most carcinogenic, followed by grilled meat, then roasted meat, with boiled meat being the least risky. Moreover, The conclusion puts processed meats in the same category of cancer risk as tobacco smoking and asbestos. This does not mean that they are equally dangerous, says the International Agency for Research on Cancer — the agency within the WHO that sets the classifications. And it's important to note that even things such as aloe vera are on the list of possible carcinogens.

And:

The recommendation, Gapstur tells The Salt, is based on research. For instance, a systematic literature review on colorectal cancer published in 2011 by the World Cancer Research Fund found a statistically significant, 16 percent increased risk of colorectal cancer associated with each 3.5 ounces of red and processed meat consumed per day. As the ACS points out, this is an amount of meat roughly equivalent in size to a deck of cards.

<http://www.npr.org/sections/thesalt/2015/10/26/451211964/bad-day-for-bacon-processed-red-meats-cause-cancer-says-who>

And of course, the reason why tobacco is a carcinogen is because the Tobacco plant takes up Polonium-210 and Lead-210, and exudes it in the essential oil on its leaves along with nicotine, which is used to defend the plant against insects and other plants.

vinegar said:

Polonium-210 and lead-210 accumulate for decades in the lungs of smokers. Sticky tar in the tobacco builds up in the small air passageways in the lungs (bronchioles) and radioactive substances get trapped. Over time, these substances can lead to lung cancer.

Malcolm wrote:

<https://www.cdc.gov/nceh/radiation/smoking.htm>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 2nd, 2016 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: Chomsky on Lesser Evil Voting

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Electoral politics is a crock. What counts is movements.

Unknown said:

Political campaigns are not social movements. Even great campaigns like those of Jackson in the 80s, Obama in the recent past or Sanders today are not social movements. We must distinguish between social momentums, social rebellions and social movements. Given the massive national security state and the pervasive carceral state, social movements are rare -- past, present and future. The American Empire is more ripe for a counter-revolution than revolution, for right-wing movements than left-wing ones. This is so primarily because of the deep xenophobic roots in the country and profound militaristic sentiments in the culture. Hence, progressive social momentums and chaotic social rebellions are more likely to reshape our priorities and gain some concessions from greedy elites and callous citizens. This is why moral and spiritual dimensions of social activism are crucial -- to sustain our will to fight inside and outside the system with little chance of immediate victory!

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/36488-cornel-west-black-americans-neoliberal-sleepwalking-is-coming-to-an-end>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 2nd, 2016 at 4:43 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Until they smell bacon...

vinegar said:

Class 1 carcinogen, meaning its mechanisms for producing cancer is well understood.
iirc 100g of bacon equates to smoking 7 cigarettes

Funnily enough bacon tastes like crap with all the salt and seasoning. I've been eating pumpkin spinach and purple potato stews no salt some pepper and lemon juice... after a time these taste unbelievably good, and everything that used to taste good like cheese or in and out chocolate milkshake, now taste like crap

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what kind of bacon you are eating.

As far as tastes go, of course if you stop eating processed crapola, your sense of taste reorients itself.

As for myself, I don't eat processed crapola.

I never knew bacon could give you lung cancer, or that some people ate cigarettes, amazing!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 2nd, 2016 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

Simon said:

This [not taking the precepts] has made no difference at all to my practice which continues to deepen.

boda said:

You can't know what your practice would be like had you taken the precepts since you haven't lived that life.

Malcolm wrote:

Do you realize how presumptuous you are being?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, August 2nd, 2016 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, there is also the Barney Frank argument: "Vote for Clinton to humiliate the whiny, little bitch."

Queequeg said:
"whiny, little bitch"?

Well, that is some zinger coming out of his lisping mouth. It could only be more poignant if it was delivered with a finger snap by some flamboyant twink strutting down Christopher Street during Pride.

Yeah, still doesn't do it for me. Can't muster that much indignation, even against the likes of Trump.

Are you adopting this rationalization to pull that lever for Clinton?

Malcolm wrote:
It was on the Bill Maher show that he said this, I paraphrased and embellished for effect.

As for myself, it all depends on how I feel when I pick up my ballot. Right now, still voting Green.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, August 2nd, 2016 at 12:24 AM
Title: Re: Chomsky on Lesser Evil Voting
Content:

WeiHan said:
However much many of you here may hate Donald Trump, computer simulation is showing that Trump could reach the highest percentage of the popular votes, which could be more than anyone in history even surpassing FDR in the Great Depression.

But no, he won't be able to change anything. Political change is surely coming and he is just the bridge of lesser resistance to this coming huge change. Clinton will be a huge obstruction to this change.

Malcolm wrote:
You need to go to fivethirtyeight.com.

There is 0 chance Trump will win the popular vote. Well, not quite true, there is a 35 percent chance...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, August 1st, 2016 at 11:52 PM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3
Content:

Queequeg said:
Meanwhile, Clinton is as Clinton does, moving to triangulate by appealing to moderate Republicans and disaffected conservatives. Right now the appeal is limited to the Bloomberg, "God Help Us" argument, but its only a matter of time until we see the

policy concessions that will be needed to get the big name Republican endorsements that are coming. And how will the concessions to Bernie coexist with the concessions to the right? We know who loses in that case..

Malcolm wrote:

No, there is also the Barney Frank argument: "Vote for Clinton to humiliate the whiny, little bitch."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2016 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: How do you renounce everything to attain Nirvana?

Content:

Simon E. said:

Au contraire.

Detachment from food means to be completely present in the eating. In the taste. In the texture. In the pleasure. Then doing the next thing.

Jeff H said:

Yes. And attachment means wallowing in the eating, taste, texture, and pleasure, while greedily thinking of the next thing, which you want to grasp without giving up the first one. I don't see the contradiction.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is to be free of attachment AND aversion. Otherwise, the nonattachment of śrāvakas is just a form of bondage.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2016 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

smcj said:

Our teachers are not our nannies, and it demeans them for us to rely on them so. I've learned to watch myself around good lamas. I've been spanked for bad attitude and behavior, and recently too. The reprimand was not invited, although I did deserve it--sort of. It wasn't fun. But then again I am a child, so I'm sure he would have preferred for me to simply act like an adult.

Rumor had it HHK16 told CTR to stop drinking. If so he would have done well to listen.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, grow up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2016 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Herbie said:

knowledge of emptiness is the result of rational analysis

Malcolm wrote:

Conceptual knowledge of emptiness is a result rational analysis, however, this is solely an "approximate ultimate." It is not the ultimate of realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2016 at 7:58 PM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

smcj said:

Nobody has the right to lay trips on us about it other than our teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

Even they do not have that right.

smcj said:

They can make an issue out of it, just as they can call us out on any number of behaviors. We are not obliged to listen however.

Malcolm wrote:

Our teachers are not our nannies, and it demeans them for us to rely on them so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2016 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Simon E. said:

No definitive argument has ever been presented that convinces those of a different view, and almost certainly never will be.

seeker242 said:

That's inaccurate. I have single-handedly convinced hundreds of people...

Malcolm wrote:

Until they smell bacon...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2016 at 7:54 PM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

vinegar said:

don't take the vow giving up alcohol.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are following the path of renunciation, this is fine.

vinegar said:

use alcohol only in advanced practice when finding and denying the object of negation has/is trying to become habitual, at which point alcohol is no longer alcohol, and your interaction is utterly beyond desire to put things into your food hole

Malcolm wrote:

You must be a Gelugpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2016 at 7:45 PM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

smcj said:

Nobody has the right to lay trips on us about it other than our teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

Even they do not have that right.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2016 at 10:52 AM

Title: Re: Bardo of death may be a problem for becoming lucid

Content:

Admin_PC said:

Pure Land could've developed within the borders of the Indosphere and still been initially transmitted in the language of Gāndhārī Prakrit (utilizing Kharoṣṭhī script) rather than Sanskrit. Just sayin...

Malcolm wrote:

But there is no evidence to support this thesis. And what we have today are Sanskrit tecensions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2016 at 10:48 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

then things like flying and purchasing gasoline are equal to buying in meat in terms of putting dollars towards death, and must be accounted for in order for your argument to have any consistency. Which is the point..it doesn't.

vinegar said:

You're arguing that you don't need to be ethical in one thing because you can't be ethical in all things. Does it make sense to you?

If you think you have done that simply by not eating meat though, I think you are deeply fooling yourself.

Noone has any time to care about anyone else's intention. Also it is irrelevant and offtopic.

The only relevancy is 'am i willing to kill a person once a week to eat them, or not?'

If not, then 'am i willing to pay someone to hire ppl to kill them so i can get some meat?'

Malcolm wrote:

The old cannibalism fallacy...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, August 1st, 2016 at 9:43 AM

Title: Re: Chomsky on Lesser Evil Voting

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Trump is just not capable of wreaking the havoc everyone fears. However, there is one solid argument for voting for Clinton, and that is to humiliate Trump.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 31st, 2016 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Good Ngondro schedule without burnout

Content:

Lazy Monk said:

What is a realistic schedule for doing the four Ngondro practices when not attending any retreats?

My ego desires to finish them as quickly as possible, turning the practice into a project, which is a wrong approach obviously. The ego also gets bored and burned out easily, so

how many hours a day is a balanced way, without getting fed up by it?

Athrititis in both knees prevent prostrations, but read in another thread that:

"Lama Pema Dorje, in response to older students who find it physically difficult/impossible to do prostrations, has instituted an alternative: For those 50 years old and older, 10 million Vajra Guru mantra in three years"

How long does it take to finish one such mantra?

And what is a so-called "table prostration" for those with a physical disability, and how long does each take?

Planning on doing the Ngondro without retreats. But time itself is not a problem. Just want to avoid a burn-out halfway.

Can I ask a Karma Kagyu Lama in Oslo to get the permission to begin Ngondro even though I will practice Dzogchen within Nyingma? Or is that not an optimal solution? Ask because I can't seem to find any Nyingma center in Norway. Can move to Gomde in Denmark however, later this autumn.

Malcolm wrote:

Find a teacher, ask them. Replies to this question given here will not address your needs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 31st, 2016 at 11:08 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

A pastor goes from No Trump to supporting him as a 'morally good choice' - flaws and all:

<http://townhall.com/columnists/waynegrudem/2016/07/28/why-voting-for-donald-trump-is-a-morally-good-choice-n2199564>

Malcolm wrote:

Strange choice.

But not when you consider Trump's cynical exploitation of social conservatives.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 31st, 2016 at 10:20 AM

Title: Re: Avadana

Content:

Nyedrag Yeshe said:

Any source for avadana tales in english?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the first volume of the Divyavadana is in English.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 31st, 2016 at 10:10 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

smcj said:

<http://m.huffpost.com/us/entry/11270440>

At the same time, people seeking a better life - now as in the past — clamor to live in the United States.

mañjughoṣamaṇi said:

People tend to migrate to places where capital is concentrated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 31st, 2016 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am saying that refusing to eat meat is an appalling waste of life

vinegar said:

The killing is the waste of life.

So how does eating a pig's corpse make the no-longer-existing pig's life not a waste?

Malcolm wrote:

When a practitioner consumes the the meat of a deceased animal (and the arguments about cannibalism, etc, are utterly specious) in a state of mindfulness and attention, the consciousness of the sentient being involved is benefitted though the creation of positive karmic connection between the the practitioner and that being. In the end, when that practitioner become an awakened person, all those sentient beings will be reborn as their disciple. So says my guru, and for me, that is the final word. YMMV.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 30th, 2016 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:

As far as not wasting food, that is not the subject of discussion so not surprising it

hasn't come up. But since it has, I am a "Vege-Buddhist" who also hates wasting food. The numbers which I'm sure you're aware of are just appalling, especially in the US.

Also confused by the intention of some arguments here.

Are people saying that someone who abstains from meat, in whatever imperfect attempt to reduce harm, should instead just eat meat like everyone else?

Malcolm wrote:

I am saying that refusing to eat meat is an appalling waste of life because, quite frankly, we live in a world where animals eat other animals.

Ahimsa is admirable, and if some how, the world woke up one day and all the humans in it lost their appetite for meat and ceased to slaughter animals, as well as ceased keeping pets and livestock (chickens, mainly) that require animal protein their diets, that would be just fine with me. For example, some of our fine vegetarian friends here definitely have cats and dogs and feed them standard dog and cat food.

In the meantime, arguing that one ought not eat slaughtered meat while countless millions of animals are being slaughtered all the time is a recommendation to waste lives and food.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 30th, 2016 at 7:31 PM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

if you did not see it killed, kill it yourself, or directly order it killed (for example, placing an order for a side of beef with your local beef CSA), there is no problem. Why? Because you cannot inflict suffering on a piece of dead meat anymore than you can inflict suffering on a wool sweater or leather boots.

vinegar said:

I know, my argument is from the pov of the desire that is at the foundation of the industry. If you fail to abstain from that desire then you encourage it, make it not taboo, participate alongside it, giving the impression that it is normal, healthy, and acceptable.

Especially when it costs you nothing, the opposite, you would get healthier from it. So rather than benefit your health, and try to convince others to drop the object supporting the industry (their craving), you just decide to go along with it instead. Shrug.

(I'm talking "you" in general)

Malcolm wrote:

But in fact it is normal, as any examination of the world will quickly demonstrate.

As to your debatable contention that abstaining from eating meat is "healthier," the four

Medicine Tantras list many, many kinds of meat and their health benefits, as well as the health benefits of alcohol, moderately used.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 30th, 2016 at 10:10 AM

Title: Re: Bardo of death may be a problem for becoming lucid

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

what page

Admin_PC said:

Preface xii

p125-129

The extant Sanskrit of the Larger Sukhavativyuha is

https://archive.org/stream/BuddhistSanskritLiteratureOfNepal_784/FinalBookBuddhistSanskritLiteratureOfNepalByShankerThapa_djvu.txt

The extant Chinese translations are all much earlier.

rory said:

As AdminPC points out the Chinese translations are much earlier and don't involve Sanskrit at all! Modern scholarly thinking is that Pure Land originated in Central Asia, Lokasema came from Kushan,

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lokaksema_%28Buddhist_monk%29

so we have to refine our past assumptions. Pure Land came from the West, which is pretty cool to think about.

gassho

Rory

Malcolm wrote:

The Kushana empire formed much of what is northern India, as well as Pakistan, Afghanistan, etc.

rory said:

Kanishka I (c. 127 – c. 140)[edit]

Kanishka, Mathura Museum.

The rule of Kanishka the Great, fifth Kushan king, who flourished for about 13 years from c. 127. Upon his accession, Kanishka ruled a huge territory (virtually all of northern India), south to Ujjain and Kundina and east beyond Pataliputra, according to the Rabatak inscription:

The Qila Mubarak fort at Bathinda, India was built by Kanishka the Great.

In the year one, it has been proclaimed unto India, unto the whole realm of the

governing class, including Koonadeano (Kaundiny, Kundina) and the city of Ozeno (Ozene, Ujjain) and the city of Zageda (Saketa) and the city of Kozambo (Kausambi) and the city of Palabotro (Pataliputra) and so long unto (i.e. as far as) the city of Ziri-tambo (Sri-Champa).

— Rabatak inscription, Lines 4–6

His territory was administered from two capitals: Purushapura (now Peshawar in northwestern Pakistan) and Mathura, in northern India. He is also credited (along with Raja Dab) for building the massive, ancient Fort at Bathinda (Qila Mubarak), in the modern city of Bathinda, Indian Punjab.

The Kushans also had a summer capital in Bagram (then known as Kapisa), where the "Begram Treasure", comprising works of art from Greece to China, has been found. According to the Rabatak inscription, Kanishka was the son of Vima Kadphises, the grandson of Sadashkana, and the great-grandson of Kujula Kadphises. Kanishka's era is now generally accepted to have begun in 127 on the basis of Harry Falk's ground-breaking research.[51][52] Kanishka's era was used as a calendar reference by the Kushans for about a century, until the decline of the Kushan realm.

Malcolm wrote:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kushan_Empire

rory said:

Lokaksema was a Kushan of Yuezhi ethnicity from Gandhara. (See Greco-Buddhism.) His ethnicity is described in his adopted Chinese name by the prefix Zhi (Chinese: 支), an abbreviation of Yuezhi (Chinese: 月支). As a Kushan Yuezhi, his native tongue might have been the official Kushan language, Bactrian, one of the Tocharian languages, or even Persian or Greek. All of these are Indo-European languages and were spoken by the peoples of the Kushan Empire during his era.

Malcolm wrote:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lokaksema_%28Buddhist_monk%29

Saying that Lokaksema comes from "Kushan" is less than descriptive. His name is Sanskrit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 30th, 2016 at 6:45 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

vinegar said:

Unfortunately i cannot choose a dead body to eat among bodies that were not killed, and there is no reasoning that contributing to it outdoes abstaining.

Malcolm wrote:

Is there something magical about a body that someone killed that makes it taboo, as opposed to a body that apparently died naturally? You apparently are completely unfamiliar with Bhavaviveka's discussion in his Tarkajvala about why it is fine to eat meat pure in three ways. In fine, if you did not see it killed, kill it yourself, or directly order it killed (for example, placing an order for a side of beef with your local beef CSA), there is no problem. Why? Because you cannot inflict suffering on a piece of dead meat anymore than you can inflict suffering on a wool sweater or leather boots.

Thus, for as long as human beings continue to fish, hunt and raise animals for meat, refusing to buy meat in a market, etc. is simply a waste of a sentient being's life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 30th, 2016 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For that reason, since one is liberated because of having given up the intrinsic cause of bondage [i.e. deceived concepts,] the objects which [earlier] became the condition of that [bondage] [now] become the condition of liberation. [/i] [/list]

vinegar said:

Right, we use afflicted desire to get rid of afflicted desire, to become liberated from useless crap like cancer-causing estrogenic alcohol and everything else in the desire realm.

That's the only time to use it. Otherwise we are proponents of emptiness who are have less renunciation than the proponents of essences that have developed the skill to correctly discriminated the unsatisfactory nature of desire realm objects, achieving form realm absorption

Malcolm wrote:

Objects of the three realms are never the problem. Indeed, the three realms are pure.

And yes, proponents of essences often have more "renunciation" than proponents of emptiness. Why? Since they have no understanding of emptiness, they also have no understanding of purity.

Further, form realms absorptions just are not all that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2016 at 2:57 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Oh for lord's sake, not everywhere is a college campus.

Myoho-Nameless said:

I didn't live much on campus. These things happen a lot online, that might not be for the best. but thats the world at present.

Malcolm wrote:

Poor young white men, they have so many disadvantages in our society, so many doors are closed to them

Myoho-Nameless said:

You are creating Trump.

Malcolm wrote:

Dont be daft. I know quite a bit about being a young white male.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2016 at 12:10 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

mossy said:

oh look at that, victim blaming is acceptable when conservatives are the victims.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't see any victims, I see an antagonizing asshole who nearly got his ass kicked for being an asshole. Typical Tea Party whiny little bitch dramatics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2016 at 12:06 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Trump is just using you people.

Myoho-Nameless said:

Me? No. I am not a Trump supporter.

These people would not be so "useful" to Trump if not for the bigoted spiteful controlling neo leftist trash who turned on young straight white men.

Malcolm wrote:

Poor young white men, they have so many disadvantages in our society, so many doors are closed to them (not).

Myoho-Nameless said:

People are sick of people told what to say and how to say it, what to watch, what to read, how to make and play a video game, what to masturbate to. People don't like being demonized. I was a hardcore leftist at one point but they clearly don't want anything to do with the likes of me. the left is doing the same thing that the religious right was doing in the 90s. A good chunk of the Bernie crowd millennials would actually agree with me here too.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh for lord's sake, not everywhere is a college campus.

Myoho-Nameless said:

The left created Trump.

Malcolm wrote:

Total nonsense. Fox, CNN, and MSNBC created Donald Trump for ratings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2016 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Culture fit justice

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

[

I don't think its ok for a business to choose its culture. If businesses are allowed to do what they like, they exclude the kinds of people they have always excluded - that's racism and sexism, in case you haven't noticed it in operation - and pay people as little as they can get away with - that's slavery, if they can get away with it.

Malcolm wrote:

Sadly, this is cesspool the Tea Party wants the US to wallow in.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2016 at 6:17 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

smcj said:

Steven Colbert's suggestion is to write in "Michelle".

I'd do that before I'd vote for Stein.

Simon E. said:

If I was American, so would I.

Malcolm wrote:

Stop hating on Jill, guys. She is not going to win, she knows it, we all know it. But in order for the Green Party to be anything but a blip, they have to field a presidential candidate and someone has to vote for her (in solid blue states of course).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2016 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

mossy said:

are you talking about the young turks? if so they are blatantly biased, and are the far left equivalent to fox news.

Myoho-Nameless said:

they are worse

```
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]
```

unless people on fox have spat on other people, or after going on record by manys a time being against fat shaming, fat shaming Alex Jones, wackadoo though he may be, like the vile wench Anna does here.

Malcolm wrote:

Alex Jones deserves what he got. He deliberately antagonized TYT.

Myoho-Nameless said:

You created this.

Malcolm wrote:

No, absolutely not. We are not responsible for the racism and bigotry of Donald Trump, Alex Jones and all like minded people. Trump is just using you people. Sad!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2016 at 4:17 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<https://www.scribd.com/doc/316341058/Donald-Trump-Jeffrey-Epstein-Rape-Lawsuit-and-Affidavits#fullscreen?platform=hootsuite>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2016 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

smcj said:

For example, if you are a sūtra practitioner, it is ultimately considered ideal to give up sexual pleasure; in Vajrayāna, it is not, in fact, it is the opposite.

My Vajrayana teachers are mostly monks. There are a couple of non-monks, but they are in the minority. And none of them downplay the role of Sutrayana as a foundation for Vajrayana. And none of them have suggested that drinking alcohol is a practice.

Oh, except I did know one Western lama/monk (not a teacher of mine) that was an alcoholic and used the Vajrayana as a rationalization for his drinking. His teachers were not pleased.

Malcolm wrote:

Sūtrayāna is not a foundation for Vajrayāna in terms of the path. Loppon Sonam Tsemo, one of the five founder masters of Sakya, writes (citations excluded) in his General Presentation of Tantra. First with regard to the Sūtra path, he says:

[T]he Pāramitāyāna practitioner makes that basis into a path by giving it up.

He continues a little later:

First, the basis, as explained before, is the five desire objects. Those are the basis itself, but if it is the objects themselves, how are they to be given up? Since most people are totally fettered, how are [they] able to give up [the basis]? [The basis] is not to be given up.

Now then, if one asks “Won’t there be bondage because of objects?” Those without a method will be bound, i.e., like common beings. If one possesses a method, liberation is assisted by those [objects] themselves. For example, like poison or like fire. Therefore, objects do not intrinsically create bondage. Bondage is created by the deceived concepts depending on those [objects]. For that reason, since one is liberated because of having given up the intrinsic cause of bondage [i.e. deceived concepts,] the objects which [earlier] became the condition of that [bondage] [now] become the condition of liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2016 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

smcj said:

Yet he is winning in our DW straw poll--and overwhelmingly so.

Malcolm wrote:

This poll does not count -- there are foolish people from outside the US who are pushing Trump over Hillary, and many people outside the US who in an ideal world would prefer Jill Stein.

If the poll were restricted to US citizens only, a different picture would emerge.

Simon E. said:

Really Malcolm?

Malcolm wrote:

I am referring to DW denizens.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2016 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

smcj said:

Is it the same concept when used in the two different contexts?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

In Sūtra, the path is based on giving up sense pleasures. In Vajrayāna, it is not.

smcj said:

My Gelug teacher was very specific in making it clear to me personally that in no form of Dharma are the defilements to be indulged...

Malcolm wrote:

"Indulging in defilements" is not what "using the sense pleasures" on the path means.

For example, if you are a sūtra practitioner, it is ultimately considered ideal to give up sexual pleasure; in Vajrayāna, it is not, in fact, it is the opposite.

Vajrayāna is the path devised by the Buddhas for the era (this one) when afflictions are so strong they cannot be abandoned; and therefore, since they are the ultimate causes of suffering, they must be transformed using the special methods of Vajrayāna, because in fact, they cannot be abandoned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 29th, 2016 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

smcj said:

It is the same word in Tibetan and Sanskrit, therefore, it should be the same word in English. Weariness (revulsion, etc.) is a different word.

Is it the same concept when used in the two different contexts?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

In Sūtra, the path is based on giving up sense pleasures. In Vajrayāna, it is not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2016 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Minimum requirement for getting a relatively okay rebirth?

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

As has been pointed out, ChNN's style of teaching is not "non-traditional".

Nor is it invariably "non-structured"

Kelwin said:

Agreed, of course! Maybe i should say 'not following the typical traditional Nyingma structure', although that could also be seen as incorrect. But I guess you get the meaning.

Malcolm wrote:

Every teacher teaches his or her students according to their best effort. It is not correct to say this approach or that approach is the best for all students.

There is no such thing as "pure Dzogchen," and ChNN himself said it first.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2016 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

smcj said:

And further, Vajrayāna (for the 100th time) is not a path of renunciation, though one must develop weariness with respect to samsara to embark upon this path.

Personally I like to make the distinction by saying that Vajrayana is not a path of eschewment. This clarifies any confusion the weariness of which you speak which is correctly called renunciation. Using the same word for both things is extremely

misleading imo.

Malcolm wrote:

It is the same word in Tibetan and Sanskrit, therefore, it should be the same word in English. Weariness (revulsion, etc.) is a different word.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2016 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: Minimum requirement for getting a relatively okay rebirth?

Content:

Lazy Monk said:

So what do you Tibetan Buddhists think about the necessary minimum requirements for at least avoiding a miserable life the next time I die on this potentially never-ending journey through samsara?

Malcolm wrote:

Find a a master of Dzogchen, a guru who will directly introduce you to your "primordial state." Then, practice according that guru's instructions. Even if you do not realize buddhahood in this life, or even the bardo, you will never return to samsara as a sentient being.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2016 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

Ayu said:

There are several Vajrayana teachers who wouldn't agree to a claim like this.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe amongst Gelugpas.

Ayu said:

What about Tai Situ Rinpoche who is Kagyü? "Renunciation in the Three Yanas"

<http://multimedia.getresponse.com/725/68725/documents/8770.pdf>

Malcolm wrote:

With all due respect to Tai Situ, he has been a monk his whole life. He is not qualified to discuss the issue of alcohol. It is like Mipham writing a Tibetan Kama Sutra, it was all theory with no real practice. This is why Ganden Chöphel wrote one based on his experience of women.

And further, Vajrayāna (for the 100th time) is not a path of renunciation, though one must develop weariness with respect to samsara to embark upon this path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2016 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

narhwal90 said:

What about vajrayana use of heroin or crack cocaine?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, when you are in pain, you can use pain killers, there is little difference between this opioid and that, apart from potency or purity, the effect of all is the same.

And, of course, you can try anything once. I once smoked freebase (crack), in 1986. I didn't like the taste, and I don't like cocaine. I have done methamphetamine, heroin, morphine, etc. I don't recommend these things, but the hysteria around drugs and the war on drugs is really crazy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2016 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

mossy said:

at least they are taking Trump seriously now.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they aren't. And only a fool would vote for the Donald.

Jeff H said:

If all the smart people vote for Stein, only the fools are left. I agree with you that both Clinton and Trump are bad choices. But one of those two will be elected and I disagree that it makes no difference which one.

Malcolm wrote:

As I have pointed out elsewhere, we Dharma practitioners are very few. Our vote will not sway the election one way or another. Therefore, we should vote for the right path, not the wrong path.

Our Foreign Military Sales program sells military gear to 224 countries in the world.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2016 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

smcj said:

And only a fool would vote for the Donald.

Yet he is winning in our DW straw poll--and overwhelmingly so.

Malcolm wrote:

This poll does not count -- there are foolish people from outside the US who are pushing Trump over Hillary, and many people outside the US who in an ideal world would prefer Jill Stein.

If the poll were restricted to US citizens only, a different picture would emerge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2016 at 8:33 PM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

boda said:

There's no "Buddhist paradigm" where alcohol doesn't negatively effect our nervous and endocrine systems.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is. It's called Vajrayāna.

Ayu said:

There are several Vajrayana teachers who wouldn't agree to a claim like this.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe amongst Gelugpas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2016 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

mossy said:

at least they are taking Trump seriously now.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they aren't. And only a fool would vote for the Donald.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2016 at 11:02 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

smcj said:

Speaking as someone that had to sober up 17 years ago, the problem with that strategy is that the first few drinks completely destroy your ability to gauge yourself. For instance, the number of people that would contest the validity of their drunk driving tickets dropped precipitously when the dashcams came into being. They really thought they

weren't that drunk until they saw the video later from a sober perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

And thus, you discovered your limitation.

smcj said:

My employers, credit cards, and landlord brought it to my attention. I thought I was doing ok until then.

Malcolm wrote:

It just shows at that point in your life you were lacking integration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2016 at 10:46 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I try to discover what my limitations are. But I don't make that determination before hand.

smcj said:

Speaking as someone that had to sober up 17 years ago, the problem with that strategy is that the first few drinks completely destroy your ability to gauge yourself. For instance, the number of people that would contest the validity of their drunk driving tickets dropped precipitously when the dashcams came into being. They really thought they weren't that drunk until they saw the video later from a sober perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

And thus, you discovered your limitation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2016 at 10:43 AM

Title: Re: What is 'mind'.

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Three different words:

manas (yid): "refers more to the ability to think, it is the idea of "the thinking mind""

vijnana (rnam shes): "refers more to the sense of being aware, that there is something which knows / perceives, simply speaking"

citta (sems): "refers more to the complex apparatus which contains all of the perceiving, thinking, and associated apparatus that goes with the general sense of the English word "mind". It has the sense of "the whole cognitive apparatus of dualistic mind" and is closest of all the other terms to the general sense of the English word "mind""

(quotes are from Lama Tony Duff)

Malcolm wrote:

These definitions are not traditional.

According to Vasubandhu, manas is a past mind, vijñāna is a present mind, citta is a future mind — however, they are ultimately synonyms.

tomamundsen said:

Is that in Chapter 2 of the Kosha, or somewhere else?

Malcolm wrote:

Chapter one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2016 at 8:34 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You go ahead and limit yourself all you want.

boda said:

Just out of curiosity, are you suggesting that you don't limit yourself?

Malcolm wrote:

I try to discover what my limitations are. But I don't make that determination before hand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2016 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

boda said:

Circumstances may rise in the future where killing becomes an issue. In that case making a social promise could help to refrain. Assuming that the killing in this situation were serving selfish reasons and not to save a village or whatever.

Social promises can be powerful. Willpower can be weak.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a lower yana approach, appropriate for some, not for all.

boda said:

It doesn't have anything to do with Buddhism particularly. We are a social species and

have limited willpower.

Malcolm wrote:

You go ahead and limit yourself all you want.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 28th, 2016 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

conebeckham said:

Now, as I heard it, this Siddhartha dude knew that his actions would bear some gnarly fruit, but he acted for the benefit of other human beings on the boat, and apparently for the benefit of all sentient beings in future.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think voting for Clinton or Trump will benefit anyone. In both cases, their supporters feel they are going to vote for the most beneficial candidate — in both cases, their supporters are sadly deluded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: What is 'mind'.

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Three different words:

manas (yid): "refers more to the ability to think, it is the idea of "the thinking mind""

vijnana (rnam shes): "refers more to the sense of being aware, that there is something which knows / perceives, simply speaking"

citta (sems): "refers more to the complex apparatus which contains all of the perceiving, thinking, and associated apparatus that goes with the general sense of the English word "mind". It has the sense of "the whole cognitive apparatus of dualistic mind" and is closest of all the other terms to the general sense of the English word "mind""

(quotes are from Lama Tony Duff)

Malcolm wrote:

These definitions are not traditional.

According to Vasubandhu, manas is a past mind, vijñāna is a present mind, citta is a future mind — however, they are ultimately synonyms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Talking about Vibrations

Content:

Malcolm 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: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Question about Right-Views on Rebirth/Tulkus

Content:

smcj said:

In Mahayana the mindstream that goes between lives is variously called :

The all-base or storehouse consciousness

The 8th consciousness

The alaya vijnana

You won't find it in the Pali. This is one of many reasons why DhammaWheel has its own website.

https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eight_Consciousnesses

In the Theravada the question of what transmigrates is more complicated because their version of liberation is cessation.

The teachings on Buddha Nature are much later than the Theravada So if they're talking about it they're appropriating it from the Mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

The cittasaṃtana was a doctrine of the Sautrantika school, and it has a corollary in the bhavanga citta of the Theravada school.

smcj said:

In this case I'm going to say Malcolm knows best--even if I didn't understand what he said.

Malcolm wrote:

Asanga argues that bhavanga citta (sometimes seen translated as relinking mind, etc.) and the alāya vijñāna are the same thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Question about Right-Views on Rebirth/Tulkus

Content:

davidbrainerd said:

So...is there an actual mention of mind stream somewhere in an ancient text?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, cittasaṃtana, you can find it in the Abhidharmakośa and its commentary, and earlier texts.

davidbrainerd said:

Because my impression is that a doctrine of the Buddha Nature as true self has been lost from Mahayana due to infiltration by Theravada concepts, and with the loss of the same, they had to invent a new term mind stream or stream of consciousness. How wrong am I?

Malcolm wrote:

The cittasaṃtana was a doctrine of the Sautrantika school, and it has a corollary in the bhavanga citta of the Theravada school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 12:17 PM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

boda said:

Not all practitioners are willing or able to.

Malcolm wrote:

Why take a vow you don't need? For example, I don't kill anything, so of what use is the vow of refraining from taking life for me?

boda said:

Circumstances may rise in the future where killing becomes an issue. In that case making a social promise could help to refrain. Assuming that the killing in this situation were serving selfish reasons and not to save a village or whatever.

Social promises can be powerful. Willpower can be weak.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a lower yana approach, appropriate for some, not for all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 11:19 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Queequeg said:
Bubba killed it.

Malcolm wrote:
Lewinsky was conspicuous by her absence...and Alicia Keys was better than bubba...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 9:54 AM
Title: Re: Unity of Buddhas
Content:

tomamundsen said:
Nah, it was Malcolm's response. Although I will assume that he was glossing over some of the details. Asserting the Dharmakaya as a singular entity is not a common view in Mahayana Buddhism, as far as I know. That website you are referencing, "What Buddhists Believe," is known to be authored by someone who maintains some fringe views on Mahayana Buddhism. I hope Malcolm can clarify this matter more clearly for you.

Malcolm wrote:
It is absolutely the normative Mahayana view.

tomamundsen said:
Well, OK. Thanks for your clarification, Loppon. I had previously been led to believe otherwise from someone around these parts who used your citations to prove his claim. Anyway, this view seems to reconcile quotes like this, which I was originally shocked by because of my previous understanding:

Lama Tharchin Rinpoche said:
After our teacher passes into parinirvana we have an incredible opportunity to connect with their wisdom mind that has been uncovered from the physical elements and has merged with the vast Dharmakaya.

Malcolm wrote:
The dharmakaya is one because the realization of all buddhas is the same.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 9:19 AM
Title: Re: Unity of Buddhas
Content:

Coëmgenu said:
I can assume from your reaction that something strange has been said? Was it me?

tomamundsen said:

Nah, it was Malcolm's response. Although I will assume that he was glossing over some of the details. Asserting the Dharmakaya as a singular entity is not a common view in Mahayana Buddhism, as far as I know. That website you are referencing, "What Buddhists Believe," is known to be authored by someone who maintains some fringe views on Mahayana Buddhism. I hope Malcolm can clarify this matter more clearly for you.

Malcolm wrote:

It is absolutely the normative Mahayana view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 8:51 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Jeff H said:

I don't know what your graphic means, but I don't think I missed your point about war. I was making the point that, while I support peace and any peace candidate or party, voting for Jill will support Trump. They may both be war mongers, but I think Trump poses the bigger threat generally.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I utterly reject your premise. Voting for Clinton, like voting for Trump, is a support for wrong government.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 8:44 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Why take a vow you don't need? For example, I don't kill anything, so of what use is the vow of refraining from taking life for me?

smcj said:

The way my Gelug teacher explained it to me is that simply abstaining from one of the negative actions is a non-action. It is a zero. Whereas taking the vow and upholding it is meritorious and a cause for liberation. Arhats aren't just people that behave themselves.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, I think that explanation is very limited in its understanding.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 8:32 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

boda said:

Not all practitioners are willing or able to.

Malcolm wrote:

Why take a vow you don't need? For example, I don't kill anything, so of what use is the vow of refraining from taking life for me?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 8:09 AM

Title: Re: Unity of Buddhas

Content:

Coëmgenu said:

I heard that there was a doctrine expounded by Nichiren that Amitābha Buddha and Gautama-Buddha (as well as perhaps, other Buddhas) are somehow, mystically, understood to be the same Buddha, but I don't know enough about Nichiren to know where to start to look to get information on this belief. Does anyone know what doctrine I am referring to, if it exists, and what it is properly called?

Malcolm wrote:

The dharmakaya of the buddhas is one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 7:35 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

boda said:

Effectively to this case I believe the middle way here is between training more or less diligently. No crime or sin, though perhaps a broken vow or promise, if such a vow were taken.

Malcolm wrote:

That vow, like all vows, exist for those who need them. Not all practitioners do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 7:15 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Any questions as to why we cannot continue to support the Democratic Party?

Jeff H said:

Yes. How will President Trump fix that situation? With nationalistic isolationism? Imperialism? Does POTUS really have the power to reverse globalization? He certainly wouldn't tamper with capitalism.

Malcolm wrote:

You have utterly missed the point. Both candidates are the war candidate, and as practitioners of Buddhaharma we have a moral obligation not to support the international arms trade, etc.

There is only one peace party in the world, and that is the Green Party.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Unknown said:

During President Obama's first six years in office, Washington entered into agreements to sell more than \$190 billion in weaponry worldwide -- more, that is, than any U.S. administration since World War II. In addition, Team Obama has loosened restrictions on arms exports, making it possible to send abroad a whole new range of weapons and weapons components -- including Black Hawk and Huey helicopters and engines for C-17 transport planes -- with far less scrutiny than was previously required.

Malcolm wrote:

http://www.tomdispatch.com/post/176169/tomgram:_william_hartung,_how_to_arm_a_%22volatile%22_planet/#more

Any questions as to why we cannot continue to support the Democratic Party?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Queequeg said:

This is GREAT TV.

Malcolm wrote:

It is bread and circuses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is not the anesthetic quality that is valued in Vajrayāna, but rather the conviviality that accompanies its consumption in small quantities.

boda said:

Conviviality I had to look that up. Suffice to say that Vajrayāna values chemical dependencies over training?

Malcolm wrote:

Suffice to say that Vajrayāna recommends a middle way between abstinence and overindulgence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

Simon E. said:

So I ask for the third time, does the Vajrayāna understand the anesthetic quality of alcohol, or rather aversion to pain, a viable method in the path? That would constitute a different paradigm, as you've claimed.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not the anesthetic quality that is valued in Vajrayāna, but rather the conviviality that accompanies its consumption in small quantities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

boda said:

Your point appears to be rather dull.

Malcolm wrote:

So is vehemently insisting that all Buddhists must desist from a glass (or two) of wine with dinner.

Frankly, booze back in the day was pretty awful stuff. We have managed to improve it in terms of flavor etc., quite a bit in 2500 years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

anjali said:

It's as if they are living in two different worlds...

Malcolm wrote:

They are, in fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 27th, 2016 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Expressions of Gratitude

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That's ok, but it should be:

I'm grateful to my teachers, including ones who shared as little as one phrase of the Dharma.

I'm grateful to the Buddha and the Buddhas, bodhisattvas, shoten zenjin, and all the beings of the billion world universe.

I'm grateful to the Buddha Dharma.

I'm grateful to my fellows on the path who share their time and presence and offer encouragement.

I'm grateful to my parents for providing a home where the Buddha's Pure and Far Reaching Voice reverberated since time immemorial.

I'm grateful for the circumstances of life that afforded me so many freedoms and advantages.

I'm grateful for my wonderful and supportive wife who fills our home with love.

I'm grateful for my children who inspire wonder and adorn my life with laughter.

I'm grateful for my family and friends who share their joys and tribulations and commiserate with me on this path.

I'm grateful for my neighbors who make our town a diverse and pleasant place to live.

I'm grateful for my clients who place their trust in me and give me an opportunity to serve them.

I'm grateful for my professional colleagues who have built our business into a place where we like to work.

I'm grateful for my fellow citizens who through cooperation have created a society where we are able to pursue dreams and opportunities.

I bow three times.

Ok, now it is perfect, in order of importance. (I excluded the last line of fellow beings, since they are covered in line two.)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 26th, 2016 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Wayfarer said:

The Brexit vote went against the Stay side because of apathy by the Stay voters who didn't turn out.

Myoho-Nameless said:

Those people weren't Stay voters. Otherwise they would have voted. Brexit was majority rule. Democracy. Majority of those who cared to participate.

Simon E. said:

However, a recent poll among Brexiters after the event makes it clear that a proportion of them were unsure of the full implications of Brexit and are now worried about the possible fallout (a bit late chums). Or even voted leave as a protest, not dreaming that they would win....

A sizable minority of Brexiters even thought that the victory for leave meant that all those of a different colour to the Anglo Saxon/Celtic population would now have to leave the UK even if they were third generation Brits... That's what they thought they were voting for...

Malcolm wrote:

Many of the people voting for Trump have no idea of what is implied by supporting him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 26th, 2016 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Question about Tibetan rebirth/Dalai Lama

Content:

smcj said:

"tulku of benediction"

Malcolm wrote:

This idea comes from Dzogchen tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 26th, 2016 at 7:44 PM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

boda said:

There's no "Buddhist paradigm" where alcohol doesn't negatively effect our nervous and endocrine systems.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is. It's called Vajrayāna.

boda said:

You misunderstand. As you say, drinking may be "permissible" in Vajrayāna, but permissible does not mean non-toxic.

Does the Vajrayāna understand the anesthetic quality of alcohol, or rather aversion to pain, a viable method in the path?

Malcolm wrote:

It means that Vajrayāna understand that immunity to some toxins can be developed by consuming small quantities of them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 26th, 2016 at 6:41 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

boda said:

There's no "Buddhist paradigm" where alcohol doesn't negatively effect our nervous and endocrine systems.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is. It's called Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 25th, 2016 at 11:05 AM

Title: Re: Response to Wrong Views?

Content:

Queequeg said:

I guess that's one way to see it.

Malcolm wrote:

This is why Dzogchen teachings are definitive, everything else is provisional.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 25th, 2016 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

MiphamFan said:

Anyway my point again is that Islam has not been defanged by Enlightenment values the same way Western Christianity has been (a point I believe you yourself made before). They rejected their own "enlightenment" in favour of strict legalism.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think it is fair to say that Islamic culture has had an enlightenment yet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 25th, 2016 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

MiphamFan said:

That's the Renaissance. And they translated from Arabic to Latin (Sicily, Spain etc).

Enlightenment came much later. After Copernicus, Pascal, Descartes, Newton, Leibniz laid the groundwork for a new non-scholastic epistemology and understanding of the universe.

Malcolm wrote:

And that was done on the basis of the corpus of knowledge preserved by Islamic scholars which was brought to Europe. Thus you make my point.

MiphamFan said:

If you want to say that then you might as well say the

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=102&t=22497&p=334471&hilit=scholastic#p334471>, in addition to what they got from the Greeks and Persians.

Anyway, yeah the Muslims did pass on Aristotelian thought to the Latins. But the rediscovery of Stoicism, Neo-Platonism etc was a completely separate thing which took place after the fall of Byzantium to the Muslims. These were either passed down from Greek scholars fleeing the Muslims or discovered in manuscripts from the 5th century to the Carolingian period.

The Muslim "Golden Age" died after Al-Ghazali put an end to any critical examination of the Qur'an.

Malcolm wrote:

Muslims got a lot of their knowledge from Central Asia, and Muslim high culture flourished in many places, at different times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 25th, 2016 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

MiphamFan said:

The problem is that Islam has not been defanged by enlightenment values the same way Western Christianity has been.

Malcolm wrote:

Ironically, the Enlightenment was a result of the influx of the vast corpus of classical writing preserved by Muslim scholars in Arabic translations that were back translated into Greek from Arabic.

MiphamFan said:

That's the Renaissance. And they translated from Arabic to Latin (Sicily, Spain etc).

Enlightenment came much later. After Copernicus, Pascal, Descartes, Newton, Leibniz laid the groundwork for a new non-scholastic epistemology and understanding of the universe.

Malcolm wrote:

And that was done on the basis of the corpus of knowledge preserved by Islamic scholars which was brought to Europe. Thus you make my point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 25th, 2016 at 4:34 AM

Title: Re: Real world Relations: Poll

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All five.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 25th, 2016 at 4:32 AM

Title: Re: Response to Wrong Views?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If the awakening of the sugata does not exist, then his appearance is just a delusion of the deluded, similar to an illusion (i.e., something a person believes is real, when it is not).

Queequeg said:

but this "does not exist" does not equal "nothing"..

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it equals delusion. When one is no longer deluded, for what reason would one need the appearance of a buddha? Given that this is so, just how is the appearance of a buddha not a delusion?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, July 25th, 2016 at 4:30 AM
Title: Re: Victims of Communism
Content:

MiphamFan said:
The problem is that Islam has not been defanged by enlightenment values the same way Western Christianity has been.

Malcolm wrote:
Ironically, the Enlightenment was a result of the influx of the vast corpus of classical writing preserved by Muslim scholars in Arabic translations that were back translated into Greek from Arabic.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, July 25th, 2016 at 4:28 AM
Title: Re: Victims of Communism
Content:

maybay said:
For someone with such little merit, Mohammed's words have gone quite far don't you think?

Malcolm wrote:
On the contrary, Mohammed must have had great merit for his words to be followed by 23% of the world's people. Even Māra has merit.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, July 25th, 2016 at 4:26 AM
Title: Re: Victims of Words
Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:
For example, I oppose & do not tolerate, in the sense of not caring enough to object, to many notions. But I am not 'unquestionably right' nor think those opinions I oppose are 'unreasonable or wicked' - just wrong and causative of more sorrow.

Malcolm wrote:
You also hopefully do not condemn entire portions of humanity, even though you are NOT fond of Communism.

Nicholas Weeks said:
'Hopefully'?? Just shows that after 25? years you and me and the rest of the posting minions do not know each other at all.

Wonder what percentage of DW folk have contacted another face-to-face (no, FaceTime does not count) or know well & personally another? Very tiny I surmise.

Malcolm wrote:

We know each other in this context, we don't know each other outside of it. That said, this just means that my knowledge of you is limited, as you observe, to our interactions in this medium. However, I have by and large found meatspace interactions with folks I have met online here to be salubrious.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2016 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Victims of Words

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

For example, I oppose & do not tolerate, in the sense of not caring enough to object, to many notions. But I am not 'unquestionably right' nor think those opinions I oppose are 'unreasonable or wicked' - just wrong and causative of more sorrow.

Malcolm wrote:

You also hopefully do not condemn an entire portion of humanity, even though you are fond of Communism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2016 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Response to Wrong Views?

Content:

Queequeg said:

This passage is the culmination of his declaration of his Immeasurable life span when he explains he's constantly abiding and teaching beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Because the awakening of the sugata does not exist, his magical apparitions appear to the deluded, similar to an illusion.

-- Mañjuśrimitra

Queequeg said:

Similar to an illusion? But not quite...

Malcolm wrote:

If the awakening of the sugata does not exist, then his appearance is just a delusion of the deluded, similar to an illusion (i.e., something a person believes is real, when it is not).

Queequeg said:

Your record is public... often, there's no question...

Malcolm wrote:

On a Buddhist forum, one's interest can be taken for granted.

(that includes you too, maybay, nonperson that you are)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2016 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are also not entitled to the common courtesy I extend to others, since you are anonymous, and therefore can spew forth your bigotry without fear of consequences.

maybay said:

Well I can understand why my anonymity is a sore point.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a sore point-- it merely means that your opinions and feelings are less worthy of consideration than they would be otherwise.

maybay said:

But let me assure you it works both ways, and there are many benefits, like not having to protect my reputation and all the rest of that fame and notoriety crap.

Malcolm wrote:

This is merely cowardice and hiding in the shadows. But of course, bigotry and cowardice run hand in hand.

maybay said:

Here words rest, for the most part, on their merit alone.

Malcolm wrote:

No, words never rest on their own merit, they rest on the merit of the person who enunciates them. And if you are not a person (no anonymous internet participant can truly be considered a person, merely a nym), then your words have no merit at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2016 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: Victims of Words

Content:

Malcolm wrote:
I don't recall labeling you a bigot.

maybay said:
The martyr becomes the cause.

Malcolm wrote:
How desperate.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2016 at 10:43 PM
Title: Re: Victims of Communism
Content:
maybay said:
But it is the height of temerity to judge my life experience of people's opinions, core beliefs, and actions – let's not forget their actions – as nothing but a noetic glitch.

Malcolm wrote:
You are a sentient being. By definition that makes you a noetic glitch. In your case, however, your glitchiness expresses itself as a general lack of kindness and compassion, idiotic and otherwise, at least the way you present yourself here.

You are also not entitled to the common courtesy I extend to others, since you are anonymous, and therefore can spew forth your bigotry without fear of consequences.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2016 at 10:37 PM
Title: Re: Victims of Words
Content:
Nicholas Weeks said:
Since the poor commie Victims have been pushed aside, (as is the norm) for our diversion into verbal scrimmaging, let us take a peek at 1913 Websters:
A person who regards his own faith and views in matters of religion as unquestionably right, and any belief or opinion opposed to or differing from them as unreasonable or wicked. In an extended sense, a person who is intolerant of opinions which conflict with his own, as in politics or morals; one obstinately and blindly devoted to his own church, party, belief, or opinion.
My bold - so the main thing in bigotry, it seems, is the non-melow, unreasonable quality of the bigot. Therefore, opposing firmly any opinion that differs from ones own is not bigotry unless some of the notions in bold type rule.

Malcolm wrote:
I don't recall labeling you a bigot. Others however really do deserve the term, c.f., "a person who is intolerant toward those holding different opinions."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2016 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: Namkhai Norbu and Vegetarianism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I should also add, that if you want to be a vegetarian, it is better to do so based on principle, like Dante, rather than invoke the authority of this or that teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2016 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Response to Wrong Views?

Content:

Queequeg said:

This passage is the culmination of his declaration of his Immeasurable life span when he explains he's constantly abiding and teaching beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Because the awakening of the sugata does not exist, his magical apparitions appear to the deluded, similar to an illusion.

-- Mañjuśrimitra

Queequeg said:

I've suggested above about telling people about dharma with no expectation.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't say anything unless some asks of their own accord. It's a discipline.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2016 at 8:48 PM

Title: Re: Response to Wrong Views?

Content:

narhwal90 said:

There are a number of passages in the Lotus Sutra like this ""Ajita, suppose there is a person who speaks to another person, saying, 'There is a sutra called the Lotus. Let us go together and listen to it.' And suppose, having been urged, the other person goes and even for an instant listens to the sutra."

Malcolm wrote:

Such passages presume an pre-existing interest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2016 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Namkhai Norbu and Vegetarianism

Content:

Adamantine said:

To be fair though Malcolm, you've also changed your views on this since I've known you, and it can be a hard thing to accept on faith alone.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed. I held this point of view, then became disturbed by industrial abattoirs and reversed my point of view. I then regained my equanimity, and found a deeper perspective.

Adamantine said:

So it is not as if there are no Vajrayana teachers and practitioners who keep a vegetarian diet and ethic and believe it to correspond with correct understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

If people choose to avoid animal protein in their diets for health reasons, this is fine. If people think it is unethical to kill animals for food, well, they are right, it is unethical by any Dharma standard. Patrul Rinpoche was responding to the fact that in Tibet, Tibetan monasteries were deeply engaged in ordering animals slaughtered for provisions. If you read his texts, you will see that in general he taught to avoid eating meat, but he saved his most cutting remarks for monastics.

That said, if you want to be a healthy vegetarian, learn to cook Ayurvedically.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2016 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

maybay said:

Since you use this word bigot with such vehemence and so often, consider how your use of it is any different from its definition "a person who is intolerant towards those holding different opinions."

Malcolm wrote:

You are completely entitled to your opinions. It does not make you any less of a bigot, however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2016 at 12:09 PM

Title: Re: Response to Wrong Views?

Content:

Queequeg said:

Ok. But what wayfarer points out is not negated. There is an effort to reach others.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really — this is why a buddha is likened to a wish-fulfilling gem. When found, wish-fulfilling gems grant all wishes. When not found...

Queequeg said:

This passive Buddha you seem to describe does not jive with what I've understood as the path...

Malcolm wrote:

That is the nature of understanding the difference between samsaric paths and nirvanic paths; lower paths versus higher paths.

Queequeg said:

I'd point out the active, proactive Buddha is a feature in East Asia in general.

Malcolm wrote:

I would point out that this is irrelevant.

Queequeg said:

It's expressed in the ideal of Bodhisattvas like Avalokitesvara and Ksitigarbha.

Malcolm wrote:

Ideals are nice, but they are just that — ideals; and ideals are fabrications.

Queequeg said:

It's in the Lotus where the Buddha is constantly contriving to approach beings and lead them on the path. The Buddha's hand is always extended, always active, guiding beings whether they are aware or not.

Malcolm wrote:

Sounds like you confused Jesus with the Buddha.

Queequeg said:

This impulse to serve others is a capacity understood to be intrinsic to us -just as a parent is selflessly concerned for their child. it follows that when we find a path out, even if we have not completed it, we see others struggling and know they could be freed, we might want to share that.

Malcolm wrote:

This impulse is generally speaking, a Māra.

Queequeg said:

Just as I would stop and offer a jump to a stalled driver, or give directions to someone who is lost. There's no ego in that, just the simple fact that someone needs help and I can. Car jump started, or person sent in the right direction, and off I go.

Malcolm wrote:

This is quite different than evangelizing and proselytizing Buddhadharma. In the case of helping someone with a flat, you know exactly what the problem is and what to do to help them. In the case of Buddhadharma, generally, we really do more harm than good to sentient beings through the arrogance that we can help anyone. In fact, it is impossible unless you are yourself a realized person.

Queequeg said:

It seems you guys are guided by a modesty, but the house is on fire and the restraint you practice could be viewed as callous.

Malcolm wrote:

In the parable of the burning house, it is the Buddha that calls out to his three children, trying to entice them with different carts. Who among us is a Buddha, with the capacity to help sentient beings out of that house when indeed we are just as trapped, in the very same house?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2016 at 11:58 AM

Title: Re: Response to Wrong Views?

Content:

Queequeg said:

Why is a mantra on a card handed out in time square not liberation through seeing?

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on the mantra. Not all mantras are liberation through seeing.

Queequeg said:

Assuming it is, then what?

Malcolm wrote:

People are not handing out liberation through wearing mantras in Times Square. It would be strange if they were.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2016 at 11:53 AM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Dan74 said:

Few of us, if any, understand what is really happening...

Malcolm wrote:

Whats is happening in this thread is the usual three afflictions: desire, hatred and ignorance— especially hatred.

Buddhists are so precious in their judgments of others, not understanding that their own bigotry makes equal with the objects of their bigotry— afflicted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2016 at 11:52 AM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

MiphamFan said:

Muslims...

Malcolm wrote:

We must understand, as I said before, structurally speaking, there is very little difference between Christianity, Islam, Capitalism and Communism.

Bataille's Accursed Share is required reading to understand this point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2016 at 11:49 AM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

maybay said:

What I'm saying, unrepentant liberals, is that you can project your liberal ideals on to others as much as you like but it won't stop them turning round and biting you in the ass as soon as they reclaim the hand of power. Some people watch roar and see a movie about cats. I cant get past the bunch of idiots

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the rallying cry of bigots everywhere: "I told you so."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2016 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: Witness by Whittaker Chambers

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

My current boss is a Muslim and she is more than happy with my beliefs. We discuss religion all the time. Actually a couple of weeks ago I was sharing a room with her husband and after arriving back at the hotel, completely beat from a day of running around like lunatics, we did our prayers together: he did his Slat al-Isha and I did my Dharmapala practice.

maybay said:

Your defending Islam reminds me of the 1981 movie ROAR and its agenda of proving that wild cats can partake of our humanist ideals.

Malcolm wrote:

Wow, I never realized you were such an unrepentant bigot.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2016 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Witness by Whittaker Chambers

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Did I write that it was a practice unique to communism? No. But the denial of commie spies & intellectual property theft in the past and now, was & is very popular. Spy Alger Hiss still has his defenders, blindly claiming his innocence.

Malcolm wrote:

The point, Nick, is that you seem to be involved in fighting the conflicts of the past. Communism, like God, is dead.

Nicholas Weeks said:

I agree that Islam is the far bigger problem, but look how many folk still cannot face the totalitarian nature of Islam.

Malcolm wrote:

Monotheistic religions in general are totalitarian. Just look at the social conservative movement in the USA. The only reason we do not live in a theocracy is because of the Scottish Enlightenment, and the influence of atheists like David Hume, Ethan Allen, Thomas Paine, etc.

Nicholas Weeks said:

If you wish, with your fine intellect, to call present day communism as not real - fine. But you are making an intellectual distinction that has no practical difference.

Malcolm wrote:

Vietnam will democratize as soon as they stabilize their economy. You forget that Ho Chi Minh was our ally in WWII, and was bitterly disappointed that his plea to us to help Vietnam throw off repressive French colonialism after the war was totally ignored by the USA. Likewise, Castro wrote the US Gvt. asking for aid to defeat Batista, and again he was ignored. If these two countries are nominally "communist," it is the fault of our own broken foreign policy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 24th, 2016 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Lobsang Chojor said:

Socialism is a Marxist spinoff and it isn't communism

Malcolm wrote:

This is a huge misconception. Marxist Socialism is merely one kind.

Lobsang Chojor said:

I never knew that. I've learnt alot of non-dharma topics from you today

Malcolm wrote:

An ok summary of the field:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socialism#Early_socialism

For example, the socialism of one of the founding fathers of the US, Thomas Paine, held: "the earth, in its natural uncultivated state... was the common property of the human race"; the concept of private ownership arose as a necessary result of the development of agriculture, since it was impossible to distinguish the possession of improvements to the land from the possession of the land itself. Thus, Paine viewed private property as necessary while at the same time asserting that the basic needs of all humanity must be provided for by those with property, who have originally taken it from the general public. This in some sense is their "payment" to non-property holders for the right to hold private property.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Agrarian_Justice

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2016 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Pish posh Malcolm; the point has been made, such as it is.

Just as the buddhadharma has many distinct, differing views, yet all are Buddhism, so if

one wants to parse the variety of Marxist spinoffs as different, fine - but they are all Communism.

Lobsang Chojor said:

Socialism is a Marxist spinoff and it isn't communism

Malcolm wrote:

This is a huge misconception. Marxist Socialism is merely one kind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2016 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: Witness by Whittaker Chambers

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Did I write that it was a practice unique to communism? No. But the denial of commie spies & intellectual property theft in the past and now, was & is very popular. Spy Alger Hiss still has his defenders, blindly claiming his innocence.

Malcolm wrote:

The point, Nick, is that you seem to involved in fighting the conflicts of the past. Communism, like God, is dead.

Sherab Dorje said:

There are still some adherents here and there, but really... Deader than democracy.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. I'd be more worried about terrorism and war carried out in the name of Islam, Christianity, Democracy and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2016 at 10:25 PM

Title: Re: Witness by Whittaker Chambers

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

This book is one example of another facet of communism - trying to destabilize nations via espionage.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, unlike the US policy of regime change that we have conducted for the past 120 years?

Nicholas Weeks said:

Did I write that it was a practice unique to communism? No. But the denial of commie spies & intellectual property theft in the past and now, was & is very popular. Spy Alger Hiss still has his defenders, blindly claiming his innocence.

Malcolm wrote:

The point, Nick, is that you seem to be involved in fighting the conflicts of the past. Communism, like God, is dead.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2016 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: Witness by Whittaker Chambers

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

This book is one example of another facet of communism - trying to destabilize nations via espionage.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, unlike the US policy of regime change that we have conducted for the past 120 years?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2016 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

China is not a communist country and has not been for a couple of decades now.

Nicholas Weeks said:

Pish posh Malcolm; the point has been made, such as it is.

Just as the buddhadharma has many distinct, differing views, yet all are Buddhism, so if one wants to parse the variety of Marxist spinoffs as different, fine - but they are all Communism.

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing the slightest bit Marxist about the Chinese Government. I have been there. I know. They are more Confucian now than they ever were Marxist.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2016 at 9:46 PM
Title: Re: Andy Weber
Content:

Lobsang Chojor said:
I might phone the studios as they're close to me.

I wonder why hackers would target his website

Malcolm wrote:
They run scripts that look for vulnerabilities in a range of host IP addresses.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2016 at 9:44 PM
Title: Re: Guru Rinpoche's birthday?
Content:

yeshegyaltsen said:
Actually it depends on different terma cycles, whether his birth was in monkey month or the sheep month. The difference in calendar only signifies when those days would correspond to the modern solar calendar, not when the birth is thought to have occurred.

Malcolm wrote:
Can you give an example of a treasure biography of Guru Rinpoche that gives his birth month as the sheep month?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2016 at 9:42 PM
Title: Re: Response to Wrong Views?
Content:

Wayfarer said:
Buddhism has been a proselytising religion from the beginning. That is the point of the Nikaya story about the Brahma Sahampati beseeching the Buddha to 'teach for the benefit of many, for the sake of those with a little dust in their eyes'. Recall that prior to this intervention, the Buddha was inclined not to teach, but afterwards, decided to go forth and teach, which he did, and which is the reason that Buddhism spread throughout the ancient East and remains the force for good that it is today.

Malcolm wrote:
The Buddha did not stand on a street corner broadcasting his message like a radio, with no consideration of who was listening. Instead, Buddhadharma has spread on the basis of Dharma teachers teaching those who are interested that which they were interested

to hear, and that which they were able to employ in their lives.

Nor did the Buddha and his disciples stand on a street corner handing out handbills, with hopes that people would show up at his teachings.

Proselytizing, the attempt to convert someone to one's own religion or set of beliefs, is the very opposite of the Buddha's project. Evangelism, in this instance the zealous advocacy of a cause or set of views, is also the very opposite of the Buddha's project.

Buddhadharma has spread in the world due to the merit of sentient beings, and when that merit is finally exhausted, the Dharma will vanish at the same time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2016 at 9:35 PM

Title: Re: Response to Wrong Views?

Content:

Queequeg said:

How's that different than carving mantras on the side of a mountain?

Malcolm wrote:

A mantra carved in a mountain in liberation through seeing. There are six liberations, seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touch and thinking. Liberation through propaganda is nowhere mentioned.

Queequeg said:

Why is a mantra on a card handed out in time square not liberation through seeing?

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on the mantra. Not all mantras are liberation through seeing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2016 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: Guru Rinpoche's birthday?

Content:

Adamantine said:

Right, I have indeed noticed the Losar difference, but not with major Wheel days like Saga Dawa or Chokur Duchen-- or am I wrong and those are a month off too for Tshur Lugs?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2016 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

From Rivkin's article at the blog. Like to hear all the DW sages specifically respond to the content of this quote and 2) read and respond to the articles on communism in 2016 Vietnam, N. Korea, Cuba etc.

This is so I may learn from your greater wisdom.

Despite our best efforts and intentions, America has not been as successful at eradicating communism as President Eisenhower had hoped. In the 21st Century, more people live under communism than at any point in history. While most of Eastern Europe is free of communism, China, Vietnam, Laos, Cuba, and North Korea still have communist regimes that continue to rob a combined 1.5 billion people of their human rights and liberties. Beyond the borders of communism, the populations of Russia, Belarus, and Crimea continue to suffer under collectivist and statist regimes that resemble communism as nearly as makes no difference.

One more point about my frequent lack of engagement with those wiser heads here, I post very often not to solicit responses or discuss, but just to give lurkers something to ponder.

Malcolm wrote:

China is not a communist country and has not been for a couple of decades now.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2016 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: Response to Wrong Views?

Content:

Queequeg said:

How's that different than carving mantras on the side of a mountain?

Malcolm wrote:

A mantra carved in a mountain in liberation through seeing. There are six liberations, seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touch and thinking. Liberation through propaganda is no where mentioned.

Queequeg said:

So in that light, maybe its better to not use the word "evangelism" and rather talk about public, interactive practice out in the Buddha's wheat field.

Malcolm wrote:

There are some Buddhist groups that engage (mistakenly) in evangelism. But the Dzogchen point of view is broader, more subtle, and far, far more effective at providing the causes of liberation to sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2016 at 3:32 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Queequeg said:

Everyone who is effective in their run for office is repetitive.

Malcolm wrote:

They are all repetitive, what makes it a sin is dullness.

Queequeg said:

What makes it a sin is that it might get him elected. I think he had to be dull last night... everyone was expecting a bombastic s**t show with him live tweeting.

Malcolm wrote:

He won't get elected. His message appeals to a very limited base. And if he does get elected, it proves that Hillary was the wrong candidate for the Dems to pick (#Still Sanders). So that will be on the Clintons and the Dems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2016 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Response to Wrong Views?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is absolutely no need to evangelize the Dharma. A precious human birth is something that arises from past merit accumulation. If you have the merit to meet Buddhadharma, it is inevitable that you will. If you don't, you won't. The Nicherin evangelical trip always struck me as odd.

Queequeg said:

In some ways it strikes me as odd, too, but nobody is really interested in discussing its details so, putting it aside.

I raised the argument above that there is something fatalistic in this view of karmic destiny. Kind of Calvinist.

Not at all -- if one should waste this opportunity, there is no knowing when one will meet it again. The Calvinist point of view, by contrast, was that there is an elect who are preordained for salvation.

It also does not in any way undermine evangelizing activities, because it can equally be said that the chance encounter with the Buddhist preacher on the corner was the particular manner in which that person's encounter with Buddhadharma was conditioned to happen in this life.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it does. What it means is that there is no point to evangelical activities in Buddhadharma because people will always meet the Dharma in this world for as long

as there are fortunate people and the Dharma has not disappeared. And even if the Dharma has disappeared, since suchness is always present and waiting to be discovered, even if there are no buddhas, there is always the possibility of awakening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2016 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Queequeg said:

Everyone who is effective in their run for office is repetitive.

Malcolm wrote:

They are all repetitive, what makes it a sin is dullness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2016 at 2:13 AM

Title: Re: Response to Wrong Views?

Content:

Queequeg said:

I agree, particularly with the second paragraph, though the third paragraph seems a little too timid. Not that I know what a good stronger approach would be. Just quietly practicing doesn't seem particularly effective, especially in the West where people will have no idea that a person is exemplifying Buddhist ideals. The role model might need a little more marketing around it.

Malcolm wrote:

There is absolutely no need to evangelize the Dharma. A precious human birth is something that arises from past merit accumulation. If you have the merit to meet Buddhadharma, it is inevitable that you will. If you don't, you won't. The Nicherin evangelical trip always struck me as odd.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2016 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Queequeg said:

That speech last night was brilliant.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree. I thought it was repetitive and dull.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 23rd, 2016 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: Guru Rinpoche's birthday?

Content:

Adamantine said:

Which one says which? According to the system used by the Rigpa calendar it's the 6th month... Apparently the Dalai Lama follows the other calendar indicating the 5th month.

And if it has to do with calendar systems why isn't every thing else off by a month?

Malcolm wrote:

Everything, like losar etc. Karma Kagyu's (Tshur Lugs) celebrate losar a month early.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2016 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: Is this a figure of Avalokiteshvara?

Content:

Knotty Veneer said:

it looks like representation of the 11-headed, 1000-armed form of Avalokiteshvara. He is usually portrayed as standing. First time I've seen an image of him sitting. Nice statue.

Malcolm wrote:

Standard east Asian presentation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2016 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Guru Rinpoche's birthday?

Content:

Adamantine said:

Why do some say Guru Rinpoche's birthday is the 10th day of the 5th month, and others that it's the 10th day of the 6th month? Does anyone know the deal?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on which calendar you follow, Tshur lugs or Phug lugs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2016 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Is this a figure of Avalokiteshvara?

Content:

Pumo said:

For the experts here, is this in fact a figure of Avalokiteshvara, or I'm wrong?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, it is.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2016 at 7:51 PM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3
Content:
Queequeg said:
What Trump gets...

Malcolm wrote:
Is more and more long winded and rambling...what a pathetic speech. Sad!

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2016 at 7:51 PM
Title: Re: Meanwhile, the crushing of Tibet continues...
Content:
Fortyeightvows said:
Would you say that to the devotees?
It wouldn't be the first time people had to hear protests at an empowerment...
We should be mindful of how we discuss the three jewels.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, I would tell that to "devotees." This fake panchen lama is a fraud and he himself knows it. Those fools who protested HHDL were ghost devotees also.

These people are not the three jewels.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2016 at 7:49 PM
Title: Re: Meanwhile, the crushing of Tibet continues...
Content:
Fortyeightvows said:
Do you doubt that China's Panchen Lama can properly bestow the empowerment? Or that him not being the "real panchen lama" is a fault? and that the empowerments he gives are 'fake'?

Malcolm wrote:
Yup. Yup. Yup. Plus he is a ghost devotee.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2016 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

Economists, in a market economy, use the analogy of a dollar being a "vote".

Malcolm wrote:

Thus, if you "vote" for oil, you "vote" for corn and soy feed, thus you "vote" for meat and slaughterhouses. Why? Because you are "voting" for the principle cause of industrial agriculture and animal husbandry, especially organic agriculture, which heavily relies on animal "by-products" for fertilizers, and we are not just talking manure here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2016 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

shaunc said:

The argument coming up is that if I buy product A, this will result in product B being supported by my money either directly or indirectly. Wouldn't this just be a type of interdependence that is a theory taught by buddhism.

Unless we are living in a remote area and are completely self sufficient we've all supported causes that we weren't aware of, good causes as well as bad causes.

Malcolm wrote:

The argument being made is that buying meat shows intent for and support of killing animals. I disagree, on the principle that if this is true, then it follows that buying any corn, etc., also shows intent to kill animals through pesticides, etc.

The world is made no less a grisly abattoir by refraining from eating meat. Frankly, there are more important issues to be concerned about:

```
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: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 22nd, 2016 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Terry, The Man Who Knew All About It, But Couldn't.

Content:

conebeckham said:

You will notice the Tingsha a-top Malcom's instrument...

Malcolm wrote:
Korg Synthesizer.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2016 at 11:50 PM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Oh, I will never vote for Hillary -- hell will freeze over first.

dzogchungpa said:
There's no way Trump will take Massachusetts anyway so I guess it doesn't matter, but if you were in a different state maybe you would?

Malcolm wrote:
Under no circumstances. I don't vote for neo-liberal, neo-conservatives, regardless of the party to which they belong. There is too much at stake:

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2016 at 11:28 PM
Title: Re: Terry, The Man Who Knew All About It, But Couldn't.
Content:
conebeckham said:
You will notice the Tingsha a-top Malcom's instrument or amp or whatever that is.....

dzogchungpa said:
Gadzooks, I totally missed that!

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, and you also missed the metal Tibetan horn I am holding in my left hand. This dates the photo to 1984 when I was briefly part of a band called Sleep Chamber, many of whose members would eventually become hardcore junkies. The music was and remains pretty horrible. But our inspiration at the time was PTV, Coil, David Tibet, Nurse with Wound, SPK, etc., which you can see from the little Psychick Cross pin I am wearing.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2016 at 10:53 PM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3
Content:
Malcolm wrote:

You can't win an election based on hate porn.

Queequeg said:

That's an aspirational prayer, I'm afraid.

Better make best efforts and vote for Hillary to ensure its truth.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, I will never vote for Hillary -- hell will freeze over first.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2016 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

Simon E. said:

I have a horrible feeling that he is going to win.

I do hope that feeling is mistaken.

Malcolm wrote:

You can't win an election based on hate porn.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2016 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: Terry, The Man Who Knew All About It, But Couldn't.

Content:

conebeckham said:

Malcolm was a punk rocker. I thought everyone knew that.

Ok, maybe not a "punk rocker"--maybe a more experimental rock musician. Weren't we all musicians in a past life? Or in this one?

(Assuming this screed of Simon's refers to Malcolm is a stretch, I think....it could easily refer to me. Or a number of us).

Malcolm wrote:

Just to set the record straight:

malcolm_industrial.jpg (139.96 KiB) Viewed 3092 times

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 21st, 2016 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

That is, you are basically helping to pay the wages of someone working in the slaughterhouse whose job is to keep on killing animals so you can eat them.

Malcolm wrote:

You pay taxes. So you are subsidizing the corn used to feed the cattle that are being slaughtered.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2016 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: FPMT Empowerment

Content:

bizilagun said:

Hello everybody. I haven't been around this forum for ages.

As far as I know, nor Medicine Buddha or Tara empowerments include taking bodhisattva vows (Chenrezing or Vajrasattva do, for example).

.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course they do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2016 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Response to Wrong Views?

Content:

Queequeg said:

So a sort of related question: what is the Buddhist view of secularism?

Malcolm wrote:

This "Buddhist" regards it as essential to freedom and democracy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2016 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

Simon E. said:

You are taking your stance from a different Buddhist paradigm.

vinegar said:

It applies to all buddhist traditions--which do you think it does not apply to?

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is false. For example, it is impermissible for a śravaka bhikṣu to handle gold; but is permissible for a mahāyāna bhikṣu to do so. Likewise, it is permissible for Vajrayāna practitioners to eat meat and drink alcohol, where it is impermissible in lower yānas.

This also ignores the fact that one-pointedness is a mental factor present in all minds, the difference between your one pointed samadhi and the one pointed attention of a cat on a mouse is solely the motivation driving it.

I'm speaking about practitioners with perfect samadhi or close to it (7th stage, 8th stage), not the samadhi that all minds have

You are referring to the nine stages of placement? In this case, there is no difference, as I noted.

Vajrayana accepts Sutrayana's general explanation, the only real difference being that Vajrayana makes the unique assertion of being able to attain various paths using only perfect samadhi or near-perfect samadhi of the desire realm.

This is a strange tenet, from where or whom is it derived?

This means without the generation of any form realm mental factors, meaning desire to sense object is severely controlled but not altogether understood as being very coarse and not without attachment to them being defeated

This is completely false.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2016 at 8:09 PM

Title: Re: Namkhai Norbu and Vegetarianism

Content:

ThoroughlyCutting said:

I'm saying that I'm going to "err" on the side of caution. As I don't much care for being berated during teachings for living a lifestyle that is consonant with the teachings of other lamas that I admire and my own feelings on the matter, I'm going to give thanks for the teachings and I've received from ChNN, and bow out. Whether or not his view on the matter is correct or incorrect is certainly not for me to say, but it's not right for me.

tiagolps said:

Whos berating you?

ThoroughlyCutting said:

ChNN. At least once per teaching I've found that Namkhai Norbu endorses eating meat, and as Malcolm mentioned, also chastised practitioners like me who refuse to do so, hence my post above.

Malcolm wrote:

You have to understand one critical point: ChNN states that if, for example, you are a common Mahāyāna practitioner, then of course you must be a vegetarian. But if you are a Vajrayāna practitioner, then you have methods available to you to benefit sentient beings which wind up on your plate, either as a byproduct of agriculture, or as a

consequence of slaughter. To refuse to use those methods and prefer a lower sutrayāna view makes your compassion "miserable."

The idea that you can only eat meat if you have the capacity to transfer the animal's consciousness to a buddhafiield is a superstition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2016 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

Simon E. said:

I wrote 'completely present and awake'... which is rather different.

vinegar said:

Fair enough.. even so the same argument applies; it is impossible to be present and awake without perfect single-pointedness, and perfect single-pointedness is mutually exclusive to depending on sense objects. Literally the bliss, equanimity, etc, produced by the various absorptions do not depend on sense objects on the contrary the habit for attraction to them impedes those good qualities from arising

Malcolm wrote:

Only from a sūtrayāna, aka path of renunciation, presentation of one-pointedness.

This also ignores the fact that one-pointedness is a mental factor present in all minds, the difference between your one pointed samadhi and the one pointed attention of a cat on a mouse is solely the motivation driving it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2016 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

The willfull killing is built into the experience.

Malcolm wrote:

If you kill an animal, or ask someone to do so for you, then yes. If not, then, no.

gad rgyangs said:

if you buy meat in a supermarket or order some in a restaurant, then you are "asking someone to do so for you" by putting your money into an ecomonic chain that orders more animals to be killed to supply more meat to replace what you just bought.

Malcolm wrote:

I understand that is how it appears to you. But it is faulty logic, discussed to death

already in this thread.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2016 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Talking about Vibrations

Content:

Malcolm 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: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2016 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

The willfull killing is built into the experience.

Malcolm wrote:

If you kill an animal, or ask someone to do so for you, then yes. If not, then, no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2016 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Namkhai Norbu and Vegetarianism

Content:

MiphamFan said:

Don't bother him with emails about vegetarianism.

Malcolm wrote:

Most def

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2016 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3

Content:

kirtu said:

I was asked several times if I was Jewish after a night out in Munich or Koeln when people saw that I was circumcised

Myoho-Nameless said:

Wh.....what kind of "night out" gave THAT appropriate context?

Malcolm wrote:
Better to not ask...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2016 at 2:08 AM
Title: Re: Namkhai Norbu and Vegetarianism
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
I guess you are not fond of ChNN.

ThoroughlyCutting said:
I've been fond of his teaching, with this as a notable exception. Does one have to eat meat to be his student?

Malcolm wrote:
No, but you will have to hear him endlessly chastise practitioners who refuse to eat meat for this or that reason as people who have "miserable" compassion.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2016 at 1:38 AM
Title: Re: Namkhai Norbu and Vegetarianism
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
I guess you are not fond of ChNN.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, July 20th, 2016 at 1:32 AM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 3
Content:

Rakz said:
Amazing speech by Rudy Giuliani last night at the Republican convention. Gave me goosebumps.

Malcolm wrote:
Welcome to Fascism, American style.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2016 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Meat-eating and Buddhism.

Content:

TaTa said:

Well karmapa did state that you should use meat in your practices if you are in the level that the actual protector comes to receive it (im paraphrasing). I know he is not your guru but just showing someone opinion like the karmapa who is kind of a big deal to some people.

Malcolm wrote:

Obsession about which food is pure and which food is not belongs to Muslims, Jews, Jains, and Hindus. It is not, and never really has been, a major Buddhist concern. Why? Because liberation is not dependent on one's diet. It is also not dependent on ritual purity, the observance of ethics, etc.

ThoroughlyCutting said:

It's not a matter of pure and impure: those are just concepts - and I'm not obsessed, I'm concerned. It's a matter of looking at the needless suffering endured by others, particularly in (but not limited to) the modern context of mass industrialized farming practices, and knowing that by mere passive non engagement with it one is helping to retard the continued growth of that industry. This is the world we live in, so as bodhisattvas it seems imperative that we do our part to make it better, no? Of course I'm not trying to make a dogmatic statement: for those who have the realization to help others by consuming their flesh, that's a skillful means. Examination of motivation is key to the whole enterprise of Dharma, as I understand it. Liberation is predicated upon recognition of the natural state, the relative expression of which is boundless compassion and wisdom, according to my teachers and what I've read, and there seems to be no contradiction between that and living as ethically and mindfully as possible - one of the results of which is, after one has examined the source one's food, to limit as much as possible the damage done by its cultivation. I doubt very much that I'm mistaken in this, but please let me know if i can refine my thinking.

Also, why is the comment about the requirement of a high degree of realization incorrect?

Malcolm wrote:

We can try and correct samsara, but we won't succeed.

We try to observe ahimsa, non-harming, as much as possible. As Bhavaviveka points out, one cannot harm a sentient being who is already dead. Therefore, eating meat causes no suffering, just as eating bread causes no suffering, provided that you did not slaughter the animal yourself, etc. All the various themes about this have been hashed out in this thread long ago.

The reason your statement is incorrect is simply that it is. There are many methods one can use to create a good cause for a given sentient being that do not require one to be a first stage bodhisattva on up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2016 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Dan74: Nicholas, do you actually take on board anything people reply to you?

Yes, but since the responses rarely address the link or the points I make, but just blow them off as unworthy, or misguided or uninformed or poorly motivated, I similarly blow off the automatic responses of those who cannot see the vast difference between the systemic horrors of communism and the far freer West. Why so eager to defend communism and dump on the West?

Malcolm wrote:

There are no Communist governments anymore. They lost.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2016 at 4:46 AM

Title: Re: 5 precepts. Alcohol?

Content:

Rakz said:

Most people can't handle alcohol so it would be wise to do what the supreme Buddha of our time (Shakyamuni) said about this. Just say No. Where is the willpower these days?

Malcolm wrote:

This is the fallacy called Argumentum ad populum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2016 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

vinegar said:

Kedrup Je states that wet&flowing is a common base for the 3 persons, 1 establishes water 1 nectar 1 pus n blood, due to their individual karma acting as contributing causes

There is only 1 object there, with several parts. There is only 1 world.

Malcolm wrote:

A proposition masterfully refuted by Gorampa.

vinegar said:

I know have you translated it? I can't remember the name of the book which compared the 2 views..

Malcolm wrote:

Jose Cabezon published a version of it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 19th, 2016 at 12:04 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Lukeinaz said:

That's a bit much...

Malcolm wrote:

Show the flaw in the reasoning.

Lukeinaz said:

Is it ok to say a conventional truth is true in relation to a deluded mind?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, since there are levels of delusion.

Lukeinaz said:

In this respect a deluded mind can still make distinctions such as the difference between a red and green apple, virtue and non-virtue, ect. While valid distinctions can be made the deluded mind misapprehends the object and is therefore said to be mistaken.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, deluded minds can make conventionally valid distinctions. It does not mean however they are not mistaken about the actual nature of apples, etc., and therefore, since they are deluded about the appearance they are distinguishing as this or that thing, they can be deluded while still making conventionally valid distinctions.

You seem to disagree when you said: We don't make much of a distinction between waking and dreaming, false relative truth and correct relative truth. The latter distinction, especially from the point of view of Dzogchen, are largely unimportant. This is because here, the perspective concerns leaving all delusion behind.

but now you seem to agree:

..Prasangika assents that there must be a common appearance in order to have any sort of meaningful discussion— it is the very definition of the difference between correct relative truth and false relative truth; the difference between everyone seeing one moon in the sky, and a drunk seeing two moons.

Candrakīrti states without any qualification that there are two modes of perception, true and false. Under the mode of perception that is false, we have two kinds of relative truths, true and false.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 18th, 2016 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

vinegar said:

Kedrup Je states that wet&flowing is a common base for the 3 persons, 1 establishes water 1 nectar 1 pus n blood, due to their individual karma acting as contributing causes

There is only 1 object there, with several parts. There is only 1 world.

Malcolm wrote:

A proposition masterfully refuted by Gorampa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 18th, 2016 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: At least 77 dead in attack in Nice

Content:

Malcolm 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: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 18th, 2016 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: At least 77 dead in attack in Nice

Content:

Rakz said:

There's a huge number of Evangelicals in the country but I have yet to come across one Evangelical politician who is proposing these types of things. Meanwhile in Muslim countries...

Malcolm wrote:

<https://www.au.org/church-state/february-2010-church-state/people-events/religious-right-activist-calls-for-execution>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 18th, 2016 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: At least 77 dead in attack in Nice

Content:

Rakz said:

Forget the test, we should also allow Muslim-Americans who believe in Shariah to stone to death people, chop off hands and heads etc. in their community because that is what their religion states. We as Americans should respect the religious practices of others (regardless how barbaric they are) because by not respecting them we are "trashing our values" and not adhering to the constitution and bill of rights.

Malcolm wrote:

"Sharia law" is just a dog whistle to muster up hate against Muslims. There are plenty of white Christians in America who think we should be implementing the punishments found in Leviticus, such as:

And the man that committeth adultery with another man's wife, even he that committeth adultery with his neighbour's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death.

Or:

And he that blasphemeth the name of the LORD, he shall surely be put to death, and all the congregation shall certainly stone him: as well the stranger, as he that is born in the land, when he blasphemeth the name of the Lord, shall be put to death.

Or in other books of the OT:

If any man take a wife, and go in unto her, and hate her ... and say, I took this woman, and when I came to her, I found her not a maid: Then shall the father of the damsel, and her mother, take and bring forth the tokens of the damsel's virginity unto the elders of the city in the gate: And the damsel's father shall say ... these are the tokens of my daughter's virginity. And they shall spread the cloth before the elders of the city. ... But if this thing be true, and the tokens of virginity be not found for the damsel: Then they shall bring out the damsel to the door of her father's house, and the men of her city shall stone her with stones that she die.

Or:

They found a man that gathered sticks upon the sabbath day. ... And the LORD said unto Moses, The man shall be surely put to death: all the congregation shall stone him with stones.... And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died; as the LORD commanded Moses.

But in this country, no one is suggesting that we give a test to fundamentalist Christians to see whether or not they agree with the sentiments found in the Old Testament.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 18th, 2016 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Meat-eating and Buddhism.

Content:

ThoroughlyCutting said:

Quickly stated: To form a connection with an animal by eating its meat and thus bringing it closer to liberation, one must be possessed of the powers of someone like Tilopa.

Malcolm wrote:

This is false.

ThoroughlyCutting said:

Otherwise, it's very hard to realistically call yourself a practitioner of Dharma if you willy-nilly engage in the ghoulish behaviour of eating meat.

Malcolm wrote:

If you don't want to eat meat, you are not required to.

[mods, please move these posts to the great vegetarian thread.]

TaTa said:

Well karmapa did state that you should use meat in your practices if you are in the level that the actual protector comes to receive it (im paraphrasing). I know he is not your guru but just showing someone opinion like the karmapa who is kind of a big deal to some people.

Malcolm wrote:

Obsession about which food is pure and which food is not belongs to Muslims, Jews, Jains, and Hindus. It is not, and never really has been, a major Buddhist concern. Why? Because liberation is not dependent on one's diet. It is also not dependent on ritual purity, the observance of ethics, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 18th, 2016 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: No Difference in Results?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Hi all,

I am working through Mipham's commentary on Padmasambhava's Garland of Views right now and I came across this passage: The Bodhisattva Vehicle takes its name from its cause. Its result is no different from that of the secret mantras, so both the Mantra Vehicle and the vehicle of the transcendent perfections constitute the same Great Vehicle.

To be clear, the text presents the Great Perfection as falling under the category of the Mantra Vehicle. I am taken aback by this passage, because I thought the 13th and 16th

bhumi, especially the Rainbow Body of Great Transference, was a different result than sutra Buddhahood. I've heard before that the Rainbow Body implies more capacity for emanations than other kinds of Buddhahood, but I can't say I've heard that from a source as definitive as Mipham here. So, can anyone help to clarify?

Thanks

Malcolm wrote:

It means that the desired goal is no different. It does not mean that the actual means to accomplish that goal exist in sūtra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 18th, 2016 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Meat-eating and Buddhism.

Content:

ThoroughlyCutting said:

Quickly stated: To form a connection with an animal by eating its meat and thus bringing it closer to liberation, one must be possessed of the powers of someone like Tilopa.

Malcolm wrote:

This is false.

ThoroughlyCutting said:

Otherwise, it's very hard to realistically call yourself a practitioner of Dharma if you willy-nilly engage in the ghoulish behaviour of eating meat.

Malcolm wrote:

If you don't want to eat meat, you are not required to.

[mods, please move these posts to the great vegetarian thread.]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2016 at 4:43 AM

Title: Re: Help Me Understand....

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As I mentioned above, there are many people who do not understand the distinction between the basis and the path. There are many refutations of the point of view expressed by some people in the internet with in the Dzogchen tantras themselves, notably, the Six Dimensions of Samantabhadra and its commentary.

manjusri said:

Thanks for responding, Malcolm. Is there an English translation of this text? A cursory search on Google failed to bring anything up?

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, this book has not been translated into English. If my merit and karma permit, however, I intend to get to it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2016 at 4:39 AM

Title: Re: On the fringe and on the fence - questions from a would be tantric

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Also, in both cases he did not manifest as a monk, but as a Sambhogakāya deity in union with a consort.

Virgo said:

My good friends, I just cannot support this anymore, sorry. Many thanks.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

?????

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2016 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: Help Me Understand....

Content:

manjusri said:

No one else here whose understanding of Dzogchen aligns with Jackson Peterson's? Is he considered that much of an outlier?

Another thing that stands out for me about his approach: apparently he doesn't see much point in ngödro? Or being more circumspect regarding Dzogchen's dissemination to one and all?

In a recent post, he mentioned that Dzogchen practitioners in Tibet commonly spend 8-10 years on trekchö and 8 years on Thögal and yet seemingly in the same breath states that the Dzogchen tantras explain why practice and seeking are obstacles to seeing what already is. My question to him, which never got a response: if practice is regarded as an obstacle to what already is, then why do those in Tibet spend 8-10 years on Trekchö and 8 years on Thögal?

Malcolm wrote:

As I mentioned above, there are many people who do not understand the distinction between the basis and the path. There are many refutations of the point of view expressed by some people in the internet with in the Dzogchen tantras themselves, notably, the Six Dimensions of Samantabhadra and its commentary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 17th, 2016 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: On the fringe and on the fence - questions from a would be tantric

Content:

paganfear said:

Regarding the importance of Buddha Shakyamuni actually teaching Vajrayana...

Malcolm wrote:

In general, Buddha Śākyamuni taught only the lower tantras, Kriya, Caryā and Yoga, and not in this human dimension.

kirtu said:

Of course he also taught Kalachakra in this human world, just to a handful of humans and a large number of beings from other realms.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Sort of, it is said he manifested the Kalacakra Mandala inside the Dhyanakata Stupa in South India at the same time he was teaching the Prajñāpāramitā at Rājagṛha, but he did not actually teach the Kalacakra Tantra. The same goes for Guhyasamāja.

Also, in both cases he did not manifest as a monk, but as a Sambhogakāya deity in union with a consort.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2016 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: On the fringe and on the fence - questions from a would be tantric

Content:

paganfear said:

Regarding the importance of Buddha Shakyamuni actually teaching Vajrayana...

Malcolm wrote:

In general, Buddha Śākyamuni taught only the lower tantras, Kriya, Caryā and Yoga, and not in this human dimension.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2016 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: Response to Wrong Views?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

What is the best response to these things though?

Malcolm wrote:

Compassion and a personal commitment to see the real nature of the mind that generates such a hatred.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2016 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Response to Wrong Views?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We are all tainted by the three poisons. But in this epoch, we are especially tainted by hatred. What is hatred? It is not anger, nor merely enmity, nor a grudge. Hatred is the wish that some being or something cease to exist.

We should keep this definition in mind when we are discussing politics, because the attachments and aversions implicit in hatred can be a real trap we may not notice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2016 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Response to Wrong Views?

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

Who said anything about "destiny". The reality of Dharma is that if you have no connection to the teachings, you won't find them. If you have a connection to the teachings, you won't be able to avoid them. This is just a question of samskara and punya. The teachers that came here spoke to those who were interested. They did not climb on soapboxes to proselytize. Did we appear in the West in conjunction with the teachers who brought the teachings here? Obviously. If someone is interested, we must teach them to whatever capacity we have. If they aren't interested, we should really keep our mouths shut.

Queequeg said:

How exactly does tendency toward enlightenment start? Where does the accumulation of merit commence? Can you categorically say it does not start with outreach?

Malcolm wrote:

The tendency towards awakening begins with the wish to escape suffering. The accumulation of merit begins when you wish others to escape suffering before you yourself escape suffering, just as when, under an ancient Śākyamuni, the being who

eventually became our Śakyamuni wished that the guardians of hell torment him rather than the other beings in the hell realms.

Of course, any being who avoids the ten natural nonvirtues is accumulating (transient) merit as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2016 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: `View` is a concept, right ?

Content:

maybay said:

That's probably because you have not understood why I asked it.

Malcolm wrote:

It was a quip, not to be taken seriously.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2016 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: At least 77 dead in attack in Nice

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly all, there is absolutely nothing of use that we can say about this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 16th, 2016 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: `View` is a concept, right ?

Content:

maybay said:

Srivijaya was not asking about the quote I provided.

Malcolm wrote:

He did not ask anything at all about the term "byang chub sems." Only you did.

maybay said:

Its strange, I don't usually feel regret after such a question.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't usually feel regret after answering such questions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 15th, 2016 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: `View` is a concept, right ?

Content:

maybay said:

Srivijaya was not asking about the quote I provided.

Malcolm wrote:

He did not ask anything at all about the term "byang chub sems." Only you did.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 15th, 2016 at 11:16 AM

Title: Re: Guru Yoga Sutra Mahamudra

Content:

smcj said:

I'm no expert on this, but HYT has three sections: Father, Mother, and Non-Dual. I have been led to believe that they loosely correspond to the Maha, Anu, and Ati Yogas.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this kind of statement is politics. But it is not accurate at all.

smcj said:

I must say that I am somewhat dismayed by how much resistance there is to the practices of creation and completion on a website dedicated to Mahayana and Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Zen people, etc., do not practice the two stages. Why are you surprised by this?

In India, there was a whole movement lead by such masters as Shri Simha that basically argued that the creation stage is of no importance whatsoever. Only the perfection stage is of any import. Such a practice is called "Great Perfection," but even that practice is "Great Perfection practice" in name only.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 15th, 2016 at 11:10 AM

Title: Re: Guru Yoga Sutra Mahamudra

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

HYT is not Mahayoga, Anuyoga or Atiyoga.

Malcolm wrote:

It corresponds to Mahāyoga. For example, Guhyasamaja was translated during the early dispensation. It is considered Mahāyoga.

BuddhaFollower said:

Yes I know it corresponds to Mahāyoga. But its not Mahāyoga.

Malcolm wrote:

Why do you think so?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 15th, 2016 at 11:04 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Herbie said:

1. Identifying a view as Svatantrika is no accusation. it is just an ascertainment.

Malcolm wrote:

Unless you are in fact uncertain, which you are.

Herbie said:

And talking about common appearances as a prerequisite for communication is definitely the Svatantrika view of inherent existence (Svatantrika at best).

Malcolm wrote:

No, even Prasangika assents that there must be a common appearance in order to have any sort of meaningful discussion— it is the very definition of the difference between correct relative truth and false relative truth; the difference between everyone seeing one moon in the sky, and a drunk seeing two moons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 15th, 2016 at 6:35 AM

Title: Re: Guru Yoga Sutra Mahamudra

Content:

smcj said:

I think Guru Yoga of any type is a hallmark of Highest Yoga Tantra (Maha, Anu, Ati Yoga).

BuddhaFollower said:

HYT is not Mahayoga, Anuyoga or Atiyoga.

Malcolm wrote:

It corresponds to Mahāyoga. For example, Guhyasamaja was translated during the early dispensation. It is considered Mahāyoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 15th, 2016 at 6:34 AM

Title: Re: `View` is a concept, right ?

Content:

maybay said:

What is byang chub sems?

Malcolm wrote:

In the quotation you provided, bodhicitta, byang chub sems, was translated as "pure (byang) and total (chub) consciousness (sems)."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 15th, 2016 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: `View` is a concept, right ?

Content:

maybay said:

No that's just the formless realm.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is an error-- consciousness in the formless realms has an aspect, i.e., the aspect of samadhi one holds as an intellectual idea, such a space, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 15th, 2016 at 4:57 AM

Title: Re: Enlightenment success rate

Content:

smcj said:

...ChNN does also prescribe a type of Guru Yoga (presumably to cultivate faith and devotion) to facilitate Dzogchen as well.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends on what you mean by faith.

Dzogchen is a direct perception. Guru Yoga is a way of entering that direct perception. But ChNN never teaches guruyoga in the traditional sense of developing an attitude of yearning, tears flowing, etc. He never recommends any kind of contrived practice, whether it is the contrived generation of bodhicitta or the contrivance of faith in a teacher.

When I say Dzogchen is not faith based, it is because for example, the so called natural nirmanakāya buddhafiels are one's own (sambhogakāya) appearances, they are not somewhere else that someone goes after passing through the bardo of rebirth.

chimechodra said:

Is that "attitude of yearning/tears/etc." mainly a characteristic of tantric guru yoga that is not shared with Dzogchen? Or is just a simple difference in teaching styles between different teachers?

Malcolm wrote:

it is difference in styles, mainly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 15th, 2016 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: `View` is a concept, right ?

Content:

maybay said:

I mean where earth, water, fire, air find no footing is not necessarily free from dualistic extremes.

Malcolm wrote:

what about:

How about "here long & short, coarse & fine, fair & foul, and name & form are all brought to an end."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 15th, 2016 at 4:17 AM

Title: Re: Enlightenment success rate

Content:

AlexMcLeod said:

Going by Malcolm's logic, one could even say that all paths have a 100% success rate, if you allow for enough time. Because over an infinite time scale, all possible events will occur an infinite number of times.

A better way to judge teachings than based upon the words of another, are to compare the average "good student" to see which have developed the Enlightenment factors prescribed by the Buddha. This should at least tell you enough about a lineage before jumping in to determine if you will really be heading in the right direction.

By this logic, one can tell that many lineages do indeed head in the right direction, even if the aspirants all argue over whose methods are better at leading people to enlightenment, and what bodhi really even means.

Malcolm wrote:

If you have generated even a semblance of bodhicitta, eventually, you realize buddhahood. But as you say, the timeframe is inconceivable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 15th, 2016 at 4:06 AM

Title: Re: Enlightenment success rate

Content:

chimechodra said:

Loppon, is this dependent on anything specific, e.g. daily AGY, removing doubts about the natural state, etc.? Or is simply having received DI (with or without having

recognized rigpa) enough for one to never return to samsara again?

Malcolm wrote:

It is dependent upon studying properly with a master who understands Dzogchen.

chimechodra said:

How would you define "studying properly?" My two main teachers (so far) are Shenphen Dawa Rinpoche and Chogyal Namkhai Norbu Rinpoche. I'm confident both understand Dzogchen. Is it simply listening to their instructions and teachings, applying them, and just doing your best and trying to follow that to the best of your ability?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. One generally does not understand Dzogchen over night, unless you belong to certain facebook groups...()

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 15th, 2016 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: `View` is a concept, right ?

Content:

maybay said:

They're not the same, not in meaning nor in text.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean there is a difference between rang byung ye shes and byang chub sems?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 15th, 2016 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: Enlightenment success rate

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Oh yes? And therefore all the stuff about the 21 capacities and the nirmanakaya buddhafiels must be true?

Malcolm wrote:

No one is twisting your arm. There remain people today who are quite convinced the moon landing was a hoax, shot in Arizona.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 15th, 2016 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Enlightenment success rate

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

It is dependent upon studying properly with a master who understands Dzogchen.
How do you know that?

Malcolm wrote:

I have studied properly with more than one master who understands Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 15th, 2016 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Enlightenment success rate

Content:

Tao said:

Just after empowerment? before or later?

Is not Rainbow body the stage of full enlightenment?

Forgive my ignorance...

Malcolm wrote:

No problem. There are 21 capacities of Dzogchen practitioners divided into best, medium and average. The best achieve buddhahood in this life. The next 19 achieve buddhahood in the bardo. The last, the average of the average, achieve buddhahood in a nirmanakāya buddhafiield without ever returning to samsara.

chimechodra said:

Loppon, is this dependent on anything specific, e.g. daily AGY, removing doubts about the natural state, etc.? Or is simply having received DI (with or without having recognized rigpa) enough for one to never return to samsara again?

Malcolm wrote:

It is dependent upon studying properly with a master who understands Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2016 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Enlightenment success rate

Content:

smcj said:

And given that ChNN prescribes that practice for people that are having a problem with DI, that perspective makes total sense.

Malcolm wrote:

Guru Yoga is DI.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2016 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Simon E. said:

...this has resulted in a phenomenon called Brexit Remorse...its sufferers are known as 'Regretters'...

The moral?

Dont decide matters of vital National import by referenda.

Malcolm wrote:

Should it not be Bremorse and Bregetters?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2016 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Enlightenment success rate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...But ChNN never teaches guruyoga in the traditional sense of developing an attitude of yearning, tears flowing, etc. He never recommends any kind of contrived practice, whether it is the contrived generation of bodhicitta or the contrivance of faith in a teacher.

smcj said:

I've been curious about ChNN's take on Guru Yoga for those types of reasons. I like the fact that he de-emphasises the personage of the guru by going directly to the "AH". You avoid the potential mistake of making it a personality cult that way. But other than that I've never seen an explanation or commentary on what else he means by "Guru Yoga" that is in any way different than the standard presentation.

If you'd care to elaborate I'm sure I'm not the only one who would be interested.

Malcolm wrote:

He means rigpa. That is guru yoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2016 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Enlightenment success rate

Content:

smcj said:

...ChNN does also prescribe a type of Guru Yoga (presumably to cultivate faith and devotion) to facilitate Dzogchen as well.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends on what you mean by faith.

Dzogchen is a direct perception. Guru Yoga is a way of entering that direct perception.

But ChNN never teaches guruyoga in the traditional sense of developing an attitude of yearning, tears flowing, etc. He never recommends any kind of contrived practice, whether it is the contrived generation of bodhicitta or the contrivance of faith in a teacher.

When I say Dzogchen is not faith based, it is because for example, the so called natural nirmanakāya buddhafiels are one's own (sambhogakāya) appearances, they are not somewhere else that someone goes after passing through the bardo of rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2016 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: `View` is a concept, right ?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The view is self-originated pristine consciousness, free from the extreme of the dualism of an apprehended object and an apprehending subject.

— Self-Liberated Vidyā Tantra

srivijaya said:

Brilliant quote.

Not unlike Viññanam anidassanam from the Kevatta sutta: Consciousness without feature, without end, luminous all around

<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/dn/dn.11.0.than.html>

Malcolm wrote:

It has precisely the same meaning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2016 at 7:17 AM

Title: Re: `View` is a concept, right ?

Content:

maybay said:

Maybe I just prefer "Listen, great being, and understand!" to "Oh, son of a good family"

Malcolm wrote:

There isn't any difference. It is like preferring gold over gold.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2016 at 6:34 AM

Title: Re: `View` is a concept, right ?

Content:

maybay said:
It's probably a mistake.

Malcolm wrote:
No, it most certainly isn't, since this has been checked against multiple recensions.

maybay said:
Well then it should be qualified to make the meaning clear.
The view [of the primordial state] is self-originated pristine consciousness, free from the extreme of the dualism of an apprehended object and an apprehending subject.

Malcolm wrote:
More context, which will either increase your prapañca, or eliminate it:
Oh, son of a good family, the transcendent state of buddhahood is seamless. There is neither depletion nor vacuity in suchness itself. The view is self-originated pristine consciousness, free from the extreme of the dualism of an apprehended object and an apprehending subject. The field of pure pristine consciousness is free from the extremes of wide or narrow.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2016 at 6:07 AM
Title: Re: `View` is a concept, right ?
Content:
maybay said:
It's probably a mistake.

Malcolm wrote:
No, it most certainly isn't, since this has been checked against multiple recensions.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2016 at 5:04 AM
Title: Re: `View` is a concept, right ?
Content:
maybay said:
Secret mantra is concerned with taking a different viewpoint / a different point of view. I would translate as
This view is self-originated pristine consciousness, free from the extreme of the dualism of an apprehended object and an apprehending subject.

Malcolm wrote:
But, there is no 'di', this in the passage from which it is taken.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2016 at 2:43 AM
Title: Re: `View` is a concept, right ?
Content:
maybay said:
A view is an orientation..

Malcolm wrote:
Generally, yes. In Secret Mantra, no.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2016 at 2:28 AM
Title: Re: `View` is a concept, right ?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
The view is self-originated pristine consciousness, free from the extreme of the dualism of an apprehended object and an apprehending subject.
— Self-Liberated Vidyā Tantra

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2016 at 2:19 AM
Title: Re: Ngakpa/Ngakma Teachers?
Content:
BuddhaFollower said:
So is Dudjom Tröma Nagmo the ultimate cycle since it has:

Chöd
Ngagpa hair empowerment
Creation stage
Completion stage
Trekcho
Tho***

tomamundsen said:
Question... I see the hair empowerment being mentioned quite a bit. Is there an additional hair empowerment aside from the one in the standard Troma empowerment? Otherwise, I'm a little confused as to why the hair empowerment is mentioned so frequently, but others, for example, the earring empowerment, meditation belt empowerment, zen empowerment, tent empowerment, and so on, aren't mentioned as much. So, is there another hair empowerment that is done for particularly committed practitioners? Or is it just a coincidence that it has been talked about more frequently?

Malcolm wrote:
People freak out about not cutting their hair. Also, while the other implements are part of the general empowerment text, the hair empowerment is found in a separate text and

must be added.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2016 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Enlightenment success rate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In any case, the only way one can confirm whether what I am saying is true or not (it is true, according to the texts), is to actually discover what Dzogchen is. That discovery will never happen on an internet forum.

Astus said:

Same could be said about the Pure Land path. Looks like there are more similarities than one would expect.

Malcolm wrote:

Words might seem the same, the meaning is completely different. But you won't be able to ascertain that without studying Dzogchen under a master. Anyone can decide to practice Nembutsu, for example, at any time, with no instruction at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2016 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: 8 lines of praise to Heruka and Vajrayogini

Content:

Tigersnest said:

Is there a Sanskrit version available or in circulation of these prayers?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you can find it in David Gray's translation of the root tantra.

Nyedrag Yeshe said:

If one is initiated into Heruka or the Mother, but doesn't have the lung, can one still recite the praise?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, since it is part of the initiation text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2016 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: Enlightenment success rate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but your error is claiming that both are faith-based. One is, the other is not.

Astus said:

Do you mean that with Dzogchen you necessarily gain the divine eye and can perceive other practitioners attaining buddhahood in the intermediate state and in buddha-lands?

Malcolm wrote:

This and other qualities may arise, but it really isn't the main point.

In any case, the only way one can confirm whether what I am saying is true or not (it is true, according the texts), is to actually discover what Dzogchen is. That discovery will never happen on an internet forum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 14th, 2016 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Enlightenment success rate

Content:

Tao said:

Just after empowerment? before or later?

Is not Rainbow body the stage of full enlightenment?

Forgive my ignorance...

Malcolm wrote:

No problem. There are 21 capacities of Dzogchen practitioners divided into best, medium and average. The best achieve buddhahood in this life. The next 19 achieve buddhahood in the bardo. The last, the average of the average, achieve buddhahood in a nirmanakāya buddhafield without ever returning to samsara.

frank123 said:

Isn't there an element of faith in your statements here? How can you know this to be the truth first hand?

Malcolm wrote:

When one understands that the teaching of the Great Perfection is based on direct perception, and not theories, concepts, and so on, then you can understand that there is no need to take anything on faith at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 13th, 2016 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Enlightenment success rate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course you don't see any difference between Dzogchen and Pure Land because

you do not know Dzogchen and thus do not understand its path. That can be remedied.

Astus said:

I didn't say their paths are the same, but their promises of success are very close.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but your error is claiming that both are faith-based. One is, the other is not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 13th, 2016 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Enlightenment success rate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you believe that, then practice Pure Land. If you don't, practice something else.

Astus said:

I don't see much difference between the Dzogchen and the Pure Land version. And that difference is the very small percentage of superior practitioners who achieve buddhahood in this life, while the rest are beyond normal human perception, just like the Pure Land itself. Apparently both have a faith based 100% success rate.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course you don't see any difference between Dzogchen and Pure Land because you do not know Dzogchen and thus do not understand its path. That can be remedied.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 13th, 2016 at 9:43 PM

Title: Re: `View` is a concept, right ?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, view is not a concept, at least, not in Vajrayāna.

Manju said:

Am listening to Alan Wallace on

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e8M7cADCPZ8>

The first minutes of the interview make me ask a question which sort of was lingering in my mind for some time already:

`View` is a concept, right (Alan Wallace says `theory` in the interview) ?

It`s the concept about how `things are` .

The correct concept among myriads of wrong ones so to speak.

Something seems profoundly wrong in this (my) way of defining `View` and I am not quite sure what it is.

Manju

.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 13th, 2016 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: Enlightenment success rate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No problem. There are 21 capacities of Dzogchen practitioners divided into best, medium and average. The best achieve buddhahood in this life. The next 19 achieve buddhahood in the bardo. The last, the average of the average, achieve buddhahood in a nirmanakāya buddhahood without ever returning to samsara.

Anders said:

On that note, I guess we can also say:

Pure Land: 100%

Malcolm wrote:

If you believe that, then practice Pure Land. If you don't, practice something else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 13th, 2016 at 7:01 PM

Title: Re: Ngakpa/Ngakma Teachers?

Content:

heart said:

Many great Dzogchen practitioners did the Throma cycle from Dudjom Tersar, I think that is pretty much a fact.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

There is most assuredly intimate instructions for practicing Dzogchen in the Troma cycle; they just have nothing to do with the deity yoga part.

Any practices of either the two accumulations or the two stages concerns the

generation of favorable conditions for Dzogchen practice, or the elimination of unfavorable conditions. But they are all secondary practices.

heart said:

There is nothing stopping anyone from abide in the natural state during development stage practice, and according to Tulku Urgyen it is in fact necessary in order to realise the deity. It seems the line between secondary and primary practices becomes a little hazy after being introduced to the natural state, at least in the Nyingma. But you know what I think about this, I am just repeating myself.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, which means deity practice is secondary, not primary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 13th, 2016 at 9:06 AM

Title: Re: Ngakpa/Ngakma Teachers?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Interesting, thanks Loppon

Malcolm wrote:

If you are not a Dzogchen practitioner, than creation and completion are your main practice. But if you are actually practicing Dzogchen, everything else is a secondary practice.

heart said:

Many great Dzogchen practitioners did the Throma cycle from Dudjom Tersar, I think that is pretty much a fact.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

There is most assuredly intimate instructions for practicing Dzogchen in the Troma cycle; they just have nothing to do with the deity yoga part.

Any practices of either the two accumulations or the two stages concerns the generation of favorable conditions for Dzogchen practice, or the elimination of unfavorable conditions. But they are all secondary practices.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 13th, 2016 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: Ngakpa/Ngakma Teachers?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Isn't "The Quintessential Accomplishment in Accordance with the Lineage of the Vajra Essence" (medium-length Troma sadhana) a Dzogchen practice?

Malcolm wrote:

No, dude, if it has creation and completion it is not Dzogchen practice, no matter how you slice it up or give it fancy names.

tomamundsen said:

Interesting, thanks Loppon

Malcolm wrote:

If you are not a Dzogchen practitioner, than creation and completion are your main practice. But if you are actually practicing Dzogchen, everything else is a secondary practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 13th, 2016 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hardly, Sanders has said from the beginning of his campaign that he would back whoever the Dem nominee was. That said, I am not voting for her.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 13th, 2016 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Ngakpa/Ngakma Teachers?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Troma cycle is quite lengthy. The Dzogchen part of it does not even involve practicing Troma at all.

tomamundsen said:

Isn't "The Quintessential Accomplishment in Accordance with the Lineage of the Vajra Essence" (medium-length Troma sadhana) a Dzogchen practice?

Malcolm wrote:

No, dude, if it has creation and completion it is not Dzogchen practice, no matter how you slice it up or give it fancy names.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 13th, 2016 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: Ngakpa/Ngakma Teachers?

Content:

ampina08 said:

By the way, has anyone here taken the Troma empowerment by LPD or know if it will include the empowerment or teachings on all parts of the practice, like ngondro? I would be traveling from quite a ways away, and want to leave knowing I'll have a good amount of information to be able to start and do the practice.

Malcolm wrote:

The Troma cycle is quite lengthy. The Dzogchen part of it does not even involve practicing Troma at all.

You will undoubtedly be given the short sadhana to practice, and perhaps the Troma Ngondro.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 12th, 2016 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Liberation upon Seeing?

Content:

dzoki said:

I live in Slovakia now. I still do Kagyu (Drikung and Karma Kagyu) practices as a part of my daily practice and continue to receive their teaching, whenever possible, so you could consider me a Kagyu practitioner, or Kagyu-Nyingma practitioner, though I don't really have any sectarian allegiances at present, nor do I want to have

Malcolm wrote:

I don't have sectarian preferences either, and I do accept that the practice of Vajrayāna paths of the four schools can bear the same result. But I no longer have much interest in any teachings outside of Dzogchen. Life is just too short, and getting shorter every second.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 12th, 2016 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: Liberation upon Seeing?

Content:

smcj said:

In general among standard daily practices you have guruyoga of Milarepa, guruyoga of 4 sessions, short Milarepa guruyoga....

You seem to know more about this than I do. I don't know who you are, but I guess from now on I'll have to defer to you like I do to Cone.

You wouldn't have happened to have just been at the N.A. Monlam would you?

Malcolm wrote:

He is from Eastern Europe. Maybe an ex-Kagyu...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 12th, 2016 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Liberation upon Seeing?

Content:

smcj said:

However I've met western 3 year retreat graduates that have had zero exposure to Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Yet, they all have certainly received such empowerments as Shitro, Amitabha, various forms of Guru Rinpoche, etc., all of which are essentially practices grounded in Dzogchen view, meditation and practice, as is the Karma Pakshi Ladrub.

I understand that given the close connection between Nyingma and Karma Kagyu, sometimes it is a struggle for Karma Kagyu to maintain its separate identity. It is no secret, for example, that Kongtrul's own personal practice was Dzogchen, specifically based around the Konchog Chidu cycle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 12th, 2016 at 8:35 PM

Title: Re: Liberation upon Seeing?

Content:

smcj said:

And btw, generally Karma Kagyupas practice Mahamudra, not Dzogchen. They think it's better than Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they don't think it is better. They think that most people do not have the capacity for Dzogchen. If they thought that Mahāmudra was better, why is it that most Karma Kagyu practices are termas?

dzoki said:

I think it is quite far fetched to say that most of Karma Kagyu practices are termas. Most of daily practices are certainly not terma, also what is practiced in retreat is mostly Karma Kagyu compositions and not terma.

As for dzogchen, most of Karma Kagyupa's that I have met consider mahamudra and dzogchen to be equal, their reasoning is that there is no higher state than the natural state of mind, which is the state of mahamudra and dzogchen, so in their view there is no difference between the two (when it comes to one being higher and the other being

lower).

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, there is a very funny interaction between Kalu Rinpoche and Dudjom Rinpoche over this very question, with Dudjom Rinpoche pointing out that all of Kalu Rinpoche's own daily practices were in fact from the terma tradition.

I don't know about other centers, but at KTD, which is in Woodstock, NY, most of the daily practice are termas. And just look at their catalogue of publications:

<http://www.kagyu.org/ktdpub/catalog/web/viewer.html>

and,

http://www.namsebangdzo.com/Pecha_s/2548.htm

Absolutely most of the daily practices they sell on their website are termas.

Their three year retreat program is a different thing, but of course, the Karma Pakshi Guru Sadhana is a major thing, yet another terma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 12th, 2016 at 8:24 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

mossy said:

and he just burned out. back to the way he was at the start of the race.

Malcolm wrote:

You might think Sanders burned out. But at least he did not self-immolate like this guy:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 12th, 2016 at 8:14 PM

Title: Re: Enlightenment success rate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen, 100%.

Tao said:

Just after empowerment? before or later?

Is not Rainbow body the stage of full enlightenment?

Forgive my ignorance...

Malcolm wrote:

No problem. There are 21 capacities of Dzogchen practitioners divided into best, medium and average. The best achieve buddhahood in this life. The next 19 achieve buddhahood in the bardo. The last, the average of the average, achieve buddhahood in a nirmanakāya buddhahood without ever returning to samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 12th, 2016 at 8:07 PM

Title: Re: Enlightenment success rate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen, 100%.

Tao said:

Not sure if this is the right place for this request but here I go.

I'm looking for references about enlightenment success rate references in any kind of buddhist doctrine or collective.

For example I recall reading in some book by Dakpo Tashi Namgyal (I think it was "Clarifying the natural state") that two thirds of the monks with some master reached the one-taste Mahamudra yoga but none of them was into non-meditation yoga.

I'm sorry for not being more specific in my example I can't recall more details...

Are there other references like this? (Mahayana or Vajrayana)

Thank you a lot.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 12th, 2016 at 7:54 PM

Title: Re: Liberation upon Seeing?

Content:

smcj said:

And btw, generally Karma Kagyupas practice Mahamudra, not Dzogchen. They think it's better than Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they don't think it is better. They think that most people do not have the capacity for Dzogchen. If they thought that Mahāmudra was better, why is it that most Karma Kagyu practices are termas?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 12th, 2016 at 10:12 AM

Title: Re: How to drop effort

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Like the title says. Could have put it in the Mahamudra section too I guess.

How do you drop effort, without producing more effort?

Malcolm wrote:

Drop dropping.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 12th, 2016 at 5:24 AM

Title: Re: Liberation upon Seeing?

Content:

naljor said:

what may be considered Liberation upon Seeing?

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, one must understand that the six liberations, through seeing, hearing, smell, taste, touch and mind are exclusively a part of Dzogchen intimate instruction series teachings.

Liberation through seeing can be in the form of statues, mantras, and so on are that are recommended as such for such purposes. Of course, this idea has become popular, so it is natural that we see somewhat wider application of this principle in some schools outside of Nyingma. But the idea belongs to Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 12th, 2016 at 3:06 AM

Title: Re: Arnold Schwarzenegger now a vegan

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Have you seen Bill Clinton lately, he looks like a vegan zombie.

dzogchungpa said:

Is he actually a vegan?

See e.g. <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/13/fashion/dr-mark-hyman-clintons-health.html>

Malcolm wrote:

Impermanence...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, July 12th, 2016 at 2:46 AM
Title: Re: Arnold Schwarzenegger now a vegan
Content:
David N. Snyder said:
Tough guys who are vegan:

Mike Tyson, former heavy-weight boxing champion is a vegan.

Now Arnold Schwarzenegger has become a vegan.

<http://yournewswire.com/arnold-schwarzenegger-ive-given-up-meat-for-the-benefit-of-humanity/>

Malcolm wrote:
Undoubtedly because they both have heart problems. Have you seen Bill Clinton lately, he looks like a vegan zombie.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, July 12th, 2016 at 2:12 AM
Title: Re: Help Me Understand....
Content:
maybay said:
Having you tried learning Dzogchen from a book?

Malcolm wrote:
Head this one off at the pass — it just isn't possible.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, July 11th, 2016 at 11:20 PM
Title: Re: english translation of yaksha...
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
The Tibetans translate yakṣa as gnod byin, "one who gives harm," in reference to the generally harmful nature of yakṣas.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, July 11th, 2016 at 7:27 AM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:
Herbie said:
Actually there is no point of view of mine. But if "is totally invalidated" shall mean "is not true" then yes, there is no truth findable in any linguistic expression.

Malcolm wrote:

I mean, you do not understand the point of madhyamaka, whether Tsongkhapa's or anyone else's.

Herbie said:

The point you understand is the one you are imputing. I am understanding Tsongkhapa's speech as presented by Jeffrey Hopkins in English. So actually I am understanding Jeffrey Hopkins. But whether Tsongkhapa or Jeffrey Hopkins does not matter. What matters is that I do understand. And there is no more for me to understand.

Malcolm wrote:

Glad you are satisfied. But I still think you have not an inkling of what Tsongkhapa actually means.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 11th, 2016 at 5:28 AM

Title: Re: Help Me Understand....

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You will find little support for Jax's views here. He does not seem to understand the difference between the basis and the path, nor that the basis refers to something that one has yet to realize.

manjusri said:

Can you elaborate a little on what you are referring to as the basis? Are you referring to one's Buddhature?

Malcolm wrote:

In the most simple way of explaining it, yes. The teaching of Dzogchen concerns how to realize sugatagarbha, the clear and empty nature of the mind. But it is much more profound than other approaches one may find in sūtra and tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 11th, 2016 at 3:53 AM

Title: Re: What exactly is Enlightenment?

Content:

Bristollad said:

Does the Buddha's reported use of Brahmanical language indicate approval and agreement with Brahmins? I don't think there is enough evidence to be able to say that.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha understood and acquiesced to the social importance of the ritual role of brahmins, as well as kṣatriyas in Indian society. How could he not?

When he was giving instructions to Ananda about his cremation and so on, he told

Ananda that it was a job for the "faithful" brahmins, not bhikṣus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 11th, 2016 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: Help Me Understand....

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We have to understand that there are many people these days who are deviant with respect to Dharma, but resemble Buddhists. The Self-Arisen Vidyā Tantra states:

The so-called “deviant tīrthikās who resemble Buddhists” deviate from being equivalent with insider Buddhists, and are only deviants because they are mistaken about Buddhist philosophy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 11th, 2016 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: Help Me Understand....

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Padmasambhava and Vimalamitra never taught Dzogchen.

Their life stories are terma myth.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Padmasambhava clearly taught Dzogchen in the man ngag lta ba phreng ba. Vimalamitra definitely taught Dzogchen as well.

While there is no doubt their lives have been heavily mythologized, there is no reason to doubt the introduction of Dzogchen to Tibet by Padmasambhava, Vimalamitra and Vairocana. Shri Siṃha as a Indian teacher of Dzogchen (i.e., completion stage without the need for creation stage) is independently confirmed in the treatises of Mañjuśrīkīrti. Shri Siṃha was the teacher of all three.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 11th, 2016 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Help Me Understand....

Content:

manjusri said:

If anyone here is capable, please help me put his views into context. I do not have enough of a background in Dzogchen to understand where he is coming from. Maybe there are others here who are familiar with Jackson and have a grasp on where he is

coming from. I only wish to deepen my understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

You will find little support for Jax's views here. He does not seem to understand the difference between the basis and the path, nor that the basis refers to something that one has yet to realize.

As far as Vajrayāna goes, there was never a time that Dzogchen existed apart from the context of Vajrayāna. Thus his thesis that various teachers adulterated some imaginary "pure" Dzogchen with "lower" vehicles is a mistaken view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 10th, 2016 at 8:48 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

conebeckham said:

As I believe the Buddha and his followers have said that the conceptual, rational mind cannot encompass the real, I maintain that there is no "ontology in general."

vinegar said:

No problem on accepting that conceptual cognition is necessarily mistaken. But what about nonconceptual cognition, if there is no ontology in general then there is nothing for it to perceive.

Malcolm wrote:

A ontology is not required for nonconceptual cognitions. The question you are really asking is, if there are no external objects, how can there be direct perceptions (which are nonconceptual). All Buddhists systems, including Yogacara, accept external objects at the level of ordinary convention.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, July 10th, 2016 at 4:29 AM

Title: Re: Discarding Dharma Texts

Content:

Jeff H said:

I have a dilemma which concerns an unmentionable and controversial teacher. This is not a question about that group, but about my actions now, as an FPMT practitioner. The issue arose for me when I was listening to Alex Berzin's lectures on Wheel of Sharp Weapons. At one point he mentions the questionable teacher by name and said, "I would not have one of his books in my house." The reason, as I understand it, is a based on samaya toward HHDL and the idea that anything associated with that school has the potential to produce negative energy.

So here's my dilemma. It was that school that introduced me to Tibetan Buddhism in 2007. I attended weekly sessions for two years, but more significantly, during that time I

studied all his texts designated as the Foundational Programme on my own. My entire experience there was very positive. I was never taught about their protector and never encouraged to protest HHDL.

Most importantly, I believe that this teacher's texts gave me a very solid grounding in Gelug teachings. When I left that school for Geshe Tashi Tsering's formal, online course called Foundations of Buddhist Thought, I found it was essentially the same curriculum, and I believe that I was able to get more out of Geshe Tashi's teachings thanks to the preliminary work I had done.

Therefore, although I accepted my first teacher wrongly, and subsequently came to believe I should respectfully disassociate myself from him, I retain a certain loyalty because, in fact, I believe he taught me well. More significantly, I still possess all the books I studied in those first two years, and I consider them to be legitimate Dharma teachings. So if I am to get rid of them, how should I do that?

Norwegian said:
Burn them.

Malcolm wrote:
Better to recycle it by tossing it in a recycle bin. Less carbon...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, July 10th, 2016 at 3:33 AM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:
conebeckham said:
But I am not asserting that "there is not one shred of anything out there" as that sounds like nihilism.

Lukeinaz said:
That want't very well worded. Would you agree "there is not one shred of anything findable out there? If not, I am curious to know what it is you are finding.

Malcolm wrote:
There isn't anything findable at all. If there were, it would be ultimate.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, July 9th, 2016 at 10:17 AM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:

Lukeinaz said:
Your language would be more comfortable as long as we agree that appearing in this

sense means from a designating consciousness

Malcolm wrote:

No, appearances arise, then are labeled, not the other way around.

If you make it the other way around, you essentially reduce Madhyamaka to a form of idealism (cognitions are predicated in linguistic universals), rather than what it is, a kind of radical nominalism.

Lukeinaz said:

So if I have this right: appearances arise dependent on the mind, are labeled, and then appear back to that very mind as if from out there.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is simpler than that. Appearances arise in the mind, are labeled and stored as memories, which can then be recalled.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 9th, 2016 at 10:07 AM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

Nicholas,

We don't deny the evils of Communism, and we have just spent half a page lamenting the evils of Capitalism. What I objected to (in the post Malcolm quoted to re-start the thread) was only your one-sidedness. Communism was a reaction to - and a reflection of - Capitalism, and we need to transcend both of them if we are to address suffering.

Kim

conebeckham said:

I am in agreement. Nicholas, your implicit, and somewhat explicit at times, Pro-Capitalism / Anti-Communism message serves to do what?

Do you think Capitalist economies are more "Buddhistic" in nature?

Nicholas Weeks said:

I am explicitly anti-totalitarian communism because I am pro-freedom of thought, speech & religion. I am explicitly not pro any modern political setup. It is just a simple fact that if one values these human freedoms, they are overwhelmingly found in non-communist, non-totalitarian, 'capitalistic' nations.

Malcolm wrote:

Well you see, right there is the difference between us. Whereas you are avowedly anti-totalitarian communism, I am simply an anti-totalitarian, antifascist, biocentric libertarian. As far as your judgement about extinct economies, the economy of Rome, for example, was founded on slave labor, as were a number of other classical economies. The caste system in India too was and is a system of entrenched class hierarchy, and ultimately, hereditary slavery.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 9th, 2016 at 8:30 AM

Title: Re: Mahanayan canon?

Content:

davidbrainerd said:

...Mahayana seems to just have a few one-off sutras that kind of float by themselves. Is this a misperception?

Malcolm wrote:

Most definitely.

The sūtra division of the Mahāyāna canon has several distinct divisions: Prajñāpāramita (which consists of many many volumes); the Avatamska Sūtra (in four volumes I think); the Ratnakuta collection (in several volumes with many scores of individual sūtras) and the general sūtra division which again is composed of many volumes. And this is just a rough overview of the Tibetan Mahāyāna canon. The Chinese Mahāyāna canon is just as vast. And we have not even gotten into commentaries, which dwarf the Pali commentarial tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 9th, 2016 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

I look forward to your review of a similar book about Capitalism.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, all of these atrocities were made possible only because of Industrial Capitalism and its efficiency in producing weapons of both mass and local destruction.

Nicholas Weeks said:

Sure, weapons do the killing automatically, no operators required. And how those evil capitalists built the Gulags and camps etc.

Malcolm wrote:

But indeed, nineteenth century and early twentieth century factories and mines were no better than gulags, with murderous guards, etc.

The workers movement in the 19th century was a reaction to the appalling conditions of living under Capitalism. Under European Capitalism, millions of native peoples were murdered, starved to death, pushed out of the way of white settlers, and so on. Millions more Africans were forced into slavery, sold, murdered, and bred like animals.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 9th, 2016 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Lukeinaz said:

Your language would be more comfortable as long as we agree that appearing in this sense means from a designating consciousness

Malcolm wrote:

No, appearances arise, then are labeled, not the other way around.

If you make it the other way around, you essentially reduce Madhyamaka to a form of idealism (cognitions are predicated in linguistic universals), rather than what it is, a kind of radical nominalism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 9th, 2016 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

I look forward to your review of a similar book about Capitalism.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, all of these atrocities were made possible only because of Industrial Capitalism and its efficiency in producing weapons of both mass and local destruction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 9th, 2016 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Is Cult like nature of Tibetan Buddhism acceptable?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All schools have a "built-in" notion of their own superiority, Kagyu included.

Karinos said:

yes yes, Kagyu too. How about Sakyapas?

I don't know much about their views.

Malcolm wrote:

What is excluded from "all schools?"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2016 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Is Cult like nature of Tibetan Buddhism acceptable?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Warning signal - if teacher or fellow practitioners are saying their Yana or Dharma is better, superior or higher than others - this is a warning of sectarian manipulation. So Dzogchen tantras are sectarian manipulation?

Karinos said:

Can't tell you about Dzogchen tantras, but many HAY tantras say they are superior over any other Dharma. But of course there is a deeper meaning in it.

However when teacher or fellow practitioner says this without explaining deeper meaning I think that is sectarian manipulation. And there are as many of them in Nyigmapa, Kagyu or Gelugpa. Actually Nyingmapas often have superiority ego built in - very strong one, so do Gelugpas.

Malcolm wrote:

All schools have a "built-in" notion of their own superiority, Kagyu included.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2016 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Is Cult like nature of Tibetan Buddhism acceptable?

Content:

Karinos said:

Tibetan Buddhism sectarianism - survival guide

<https://www.facebook.com/notes/mahakala/tibetan-buddhism-sectarianism-survival-guide/1020654761318491>

Hinayana as stand alone school does not exist anymore on the Earth.

Theravada tradition is much more than Hinayana and should not be identified as such.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense. The Theravāda school is precisely a Hinayāna school.

Karinos said:

Do you guys honestly think that senior monk of Theravada - who memorized whole Pali Canon of sutras and can give full explanation from his memory - has less capacity than Vajrayana practitioner who can barely chant one rosary of mantra daily?

Malcolm wrote:

This very much depends on what you mean by "capacity."

Karinos said:

Warning signal - if teacher or fellow practitioners are saying their Yana or Dharma is better, superior or higher than others - this is a warning of sectarian manipulation.

Malcolm wrote:

So Dzogchen tantras are sectarian manipulation?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2016 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Is Cult like nature of Tibetan Buddhism acceptable?

Content:

smcj said:

An inauthentic lama could use Dharma ideas to create a cult. That is a danger.

Malcolm wrote:

All kinds of dangers in samsara. Of those, this is the least worrisome.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2016 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: Is Cult like nature of Tibetan Buddhism acceptable?

Content:

Ayu said:

Cult-like nature is not acceptable and Tibetan Buddhism has no cult-like nature in general.

Malcolm wrote:

People who have problems with following a guru should not study Tibetan Buddhism, full stop. Actually, they are incapable of following Buddhadharma in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2016 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This just turns one's sense consciousnesses off. Tibetans for example understood that the brain governed sense consciousness well over a thousand years ago.

boda said:

Seriously? :

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously. Tibetan Medical discussions of brain injuries and injuries to nerves are instructive in how advanced their "scientific" knowledge was a millennium and more ago.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2016 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: Is Cult like nature of Tibetan Buddhism acceptable?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Does Tibetan Buddhism have a cult-like nature?

Vajrasvapna said:

Is Cult like nature of Tibetan Buddhism acceptable? Could we have a less fanatic teacher disciple relation? Since what I'm seeing in Tibetans Buddhism groups is just too ugly and the guru thing is what people use to support that.

Some quotes about that:

"In Europe and America, Tibetan teachers emphasized that to follow Guru is very important ... like that. Yes, in the essence of Tantra, Guru is important. But in this case, you need certain quality of Guru, and certain quality of disciples ... with comparison to Milarepa and Marpa. And then subject Tantra, the nature of the Tantra, the nature of the Guru, and the nature of the disciple, must be in a very proper structure. But Tantra is a very eccentric practice. It was a very eccentric practice as in the examples of Tilopa/Naropa and Marpa/Milarepa. Of course, Tantric methods is very powerful but this is not suitable for big society. A teacher like Marpa and Tilopa is not available everywhere. If you act like Tilpoa, can you take the risk? You cannot give hardship to disciples as Tilopa did. If you are 100% sure that you can liberate your disciple, otherwise you are then entirely a cult. So guru promotion is not proper everywhere. I don't mean disciples should not have respect to teacher. Of course one should respect the teacher but not in a fanatical way. There is no need and followers should not follow in that (fanatical) way." The later Sharmapa

"People these days use whatever little dharma they know to augment afflictive emotion, and then engender tremendous pride and conceit over it.

They teach the Dharma without taming their own minds. But as with a river rock [that sits in a river but is never soaked through], not even a hair's tip of benefit penetrates the other people. Even worse, incorrigible people [are attracted] to this [false] dharma that increases conflict. When individuals who could be tamed by the Dharma encounter such incorrigible, their desire for the sacred Dharma is lost. It is not the fault of the Dharma; it is the fault of individuals." Machik Labdron prophecy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2016 at 10:39 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Herbie said:

I cannot comment because I am not involved in a "Buddha Dharma".

Malcolm wrote:

Which is why your entire point of view is totally invalidated.

Herbie said:

Actually there is no point of view of mine. But if "is totally invalidated" shall mean "is not true" then yes, there is no truth findable in any linguistic expression.

Malcolm wrote:

I mean, you do not understand the point of madhyamaka, whether Tsonkhapa's anyone else's.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2016 at 7:38 AM

Title: Re: reality is a vajra

Content:

conebeckham said:

I thought it was Barbells, myself.

Malcolm wrote:

hoverboard...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2016 at 7:38 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Herbie said:

I cannot comment because I am not involved in a "Buddha Dharma".

Malcolm wrote:

Which is why your entire point of view is totally invalidated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2016 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

boda said:

New discoveries apparently support Dennett's explication, such as the so called consciousness on-off switch.

See: <https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg22329762-700-consciousness-on-off-switch-discovered-deep-in-brain/>

Malcolm wrote:

This just turns one's sense consciousnesses off. Tibetans for example understood that the brain governed sense consciousness well over a thousand years ago.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2016 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

boda said:

How do you know it's wrong?

Malcolm wrote:

Because I know. That knowing itself refutes the premise Dennet holds.

boda said:

From what I understand, Dennett claims that subjective consciousness is illusory. From what I understand, you would also claim that subjective consciousness is illusory (empty). What am I missing?

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is self-awareness, as stated above. The self-awareness of consciousness is an irreducible fact that cannot be explained by materialism, not thus far.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2016 at 4:24 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

boda said:

How do you know it's wrong?

Malcolm wrote:

Because I know. That knowing itself refutes the premise Dennet holds.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2016 at 4:02 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

boda said:

What difference does it make?

Dennett has subjective experiences. What difference does it matter if he describes them as real or illusion? Indeed it would seem more Buddhist if he described them as illusion, which he apparently does.

Malcolm wrote:

He accounts for them by recourse to a purely mechanical model of physical events, which are not themselves illusory, but are physical and irreducible facts.

boda said:

So what's wrong with that?

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing "wrong" with it, apart from that fact that is a wrong view (mithya-dṛṣṭiḥ).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2016 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

boda said:

Am I real or an illusion?

Malcolm wrote:

Only you can answer that question for yourself.

boda said:

What difference does it make?

Dennett has subjective experiences. What difference does it matter if he describes them as real or illusion? Indeed it would seem more Buddhist if he described them as illusion, which he apparently does.

Malcolm wrote:

He accounts for them by recourse to a purely mechanical model of physical events, which are not themselves illusory, but are physical and irreducible facts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2016 at 3:12 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He [Dennett] absolutely denies there is subjective experience.

boda said:

Am I real or an illusion?

Malcolm wrote:

Only you can answer that question for yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2016 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

boda said:

From a very brief google search just now that appears to be a false claim, that Dennett denies the phenomenon of conscious experience. Perhaps you could substantiate that claim.

`We're all zombies. Nobody is conscious' (Dennett 1991, p. 406)

Malcolm wrote:

Dawkins, Dennet, et al, believe that the universe and everything in its functionally inert and nonsentient.

boda said:

In a footnote Dennett states: "It would be an act of desperate intellectual dishonesty to quote this assertion out of context!"

Malcolm wrote:

He absolutely denies there is subjective experience.

boda said:

"To put it as clearly as I can: in his book, *Consciousness Explained*, Dennett denies the existence of consciousness. He continues to use the word, but he means something different by it. For him, it refers only to third-person phenomena, not to the first-person conscious feelings and experiences we all have.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.nybooks.com/articles/1995/12/21/the-mystery-of-consciousness-an->

exchange/

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2016 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

boda said:

From a very brief google search just now that appears to be a false claim, that Dennett denies the phenomenon of conscious experience. Perhaps you could substantiate that claim.

`We're all zombies. Nobody is conscious' (Dennett 1991, p. 406)

Malcolm wrote:

Dawkins, Dennet, et al, believe that the universe and everything in its functionally inert and nonsentient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 8th, 2016 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Lukeinaz said:

This appears to be the keystone of Tsongkhapa's system.

Malcolm wrote:

...in terms of sutra. And how many eons are required just to realize the first bhumi?

conebeckham said:

Well, what's interesting about the Gelug texts I've read, and very limited teachings I've had, is that even in tantric practice, Gelug practitioners are advised to bring their "View" based on this understanding/experience of emptiness to their deity yoga, and their completion stage practices. I've seen texts that specifically recommend analytic Madhyamaka analysis in the context of KyeRim and DzogRim.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, nevertheless, they maintain that without accessing the subtle mind through the two stages, it is extremely difficult to realize the emptiness ascertained in analysis because ordinary analytical consciousness is too coarse to realize subtle emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 7th, 2016 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in This Life

Content:

Harimoo said:

Is there any difference between pre-order on Wisdom Publications and pre-order on Amazon ? (shipments to Europe with Wisdom Pub are huge)

Malcolm wrote:

It is going to be internationally distributed by Simon and Schuster, so you should also be able to get it from Wisdom Books in England.

udawa said:

Alas, Wisdom Books (the UK book distributor, not Wisdom Publications) appear to have ceased trading.

Hopefully an alternative to Amazon will emerge to take its place.

Sign of the times I suppose.

Malcolm wrote:

You should be able to order the books directly from Wisdom pubs, and it will be published as an e-book.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 7th, 2016 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

King of Concentrations Sutra said:

If you analytically discriminate the lack of self in phenomena
And if you cultivate that precise analysis in meditation,
This will cause you to reach the goal, the attainment of nirvana.
There is no peace through any other cause.

Lukeinaz said:

This appears to be the keystone of Tsongkhapa's system.

Malcolm wrote:

...in terms of sutra. And how many eons are required just to realize the first bhumi?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 7th, 2016 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in This Life

Content:

Boomerang said:

Is the book safe for members of the Dzogchen Community who have not received thögal instructions?

Malcolm wrote:

The book, as stated in my intro, is intended for those who have received Dzogchen empowerment and instructions. There are no explicit instructions in the book on how to practice thögal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 7th, 2016 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Wayfarer said:

... the point about the modern scientific materialism of the sort preached by Richard Dawkins and Lawrence Krauss and Stephen Hawkings, is that they want to put science in the place of religion. It has been described as the 'religion of scientism'.

boda said:

Anything that offers purpose and meaning can take the place of religion, so yes of course science could adequately fill that role. What you don't seem to appreciate is that atheists such as Dawkins are essentially opposed to the irrationality that can result from the inability to separate "hard facts," as Bikkhu Bodhi puts it, from other spheres of value. They are opposed to 'drinking the Kool-Aid', to put it more colloquially, and yet your point seems to suggest that they are merely drinking a different brand of sugar water. If that is your point then you are fundamentally mistaken.

Malcolm wrote:

They are most definitely drinking a brand of sugar water.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, July 7th, 2016 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in This Life

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Advance review:

The text translated in this volume is an inspired translation of one of the classics of the Great Perfection, unveiling the extraordinary tradition of the 8th century pandit Vimalamitra. It introduces the reader to the secret visionary instructions of Thögal practice, the core of Dzogchen itself. Extensively based on the corpus of the Seventeen Tantras, the text reveals the entire Path of the Great Perfection in a fluid and inspiring style which carefully follows the original.

-- Jean Luc Achard

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, July 7th, 2016 at 2:48 AM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:

Lukeinaz said:
How are we to make sense of this without an implying a qualifier?

The particle is not a particle therefore it is a particle.

Malcolm wrote:
By realizing what it means.

Lukeinaz said:
How would you recommend one go about realizing what this means without analysis?
What does it mean to you?

Malcolm wrote:
It can't be realized via analysis. This kind of emptiness is inert. This is why even
Tsongkhapa maintains that one must enter the path of secret mantra.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, July 6th, 2016 at 11:49 PM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:

Lukeinaz said:
How are we to make sense of this without an implying a qualifier?

The particle is not a particle therefore it is a particle.

Malcolm wrote:
By realizing what it means.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, July 6th, 2016 at 11:11 PM
Title: Re: Guru Yoga & Lamanism: Speculations on Shingon and Nichiren Schools
Content:

Crazywisdom said:
So dakini letters come out in ones native language. Still, GP put it down in dakini.

Malcolm wrote:

Not exactly. Guru Rinpoche taught the teachings in full, in Tibetan. The Dakinī scripts are keys used to unlock the memory of terton, who then writes down what he recalls of the teachings.

Crazywisdom said:

Dakinis can hash that much content with a few letters? That's super sci-fi. I hope the NSA doesn't get a hold of that tech.

Malcolm wrote:

Much better compression than Pied Piper.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, July 6th, 2016 at 7:20 PM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Wayfarer said:

Well, I agree with Bikkhu Bodhi, and have read many arguments in support of that idea, but as you have formed the opposite view, let's not keep arguing the case. It is tangential to Buddhism anyway.

Malcolm wrote:

One of the crucial influences on the Enlightenment was the spread of Epicurean materialism through the works of the Lucretius. Indeed, the term "Nature's God" comes from this trend. Quite a number of leading Enlightenment intellectuals, for example, David Hume, were atheists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 5th, 2016 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: How to believe in rebirth

Content:

undefineable said:

The difficulty of course is how the word of choice, 'entity' in this case, is defined - in a narrow sense or in the broadest possible. Less unpromisingly perhaps, the excerpt directly raises the question of how consciousness succeeds contact and sensation rather than preceding them - dependant on the definition of 'consciousness' being used. It seems understandable for some of those drawn to the mahayana to 'skip over' these difficult but (presumably) basic teachings; maybe a minimal experience of meditation hints that they only make full sense with further such experience _

Malcolm wrote:

A mind is an entity. No entity of mind of passes from this life to the next, yet the mindstream courses from this world to the next. It is not really that hard a concept to grok if one has internalized the principles of dependent origination and essencelessness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, July 5th, 2016 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: How to believe in rebirth

Content:

undefineable said:

Having read the link in full, the question becomes: 'In what way to believe in rebirth?'

Malcolm wrote:

Quite simply, nothing substantial, no entity of any sort, will pass from this world to the next; and nevertheless, there is a connection between this world and the next, like the impression of a seal in clay, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 4th, 2016 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Dorje Drollo and Dzogchen

Content:

Kilaya. said:

Does the concept of "crazy wisdom" (yeshe chölwa) - which is often associated with Drollo - exist in any tradition or text apart from Trungpa's books?

Malcolm wrote:

Textually, speaking, I could only find one instance of the term 'chol ba'i ye shes being used, in connection with Mañjuvajra sadhana in the Tengyur, at TBRC. And they have many Drollo and other texts that are text searchable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 4th, 2016 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: To Free Trade or Not to Free Trade

Content:

Myoho-Nameless said:

The amount of influence and control "corporations" have over the economy is pretty anti free trade. Being in favor of free trade is being against that "corporatism" we all don't like.

I am attracted to mutualism as it combines socialism with free markets.

My thoughts on nationalism at present are convoluted at best. But I think "countries" are now or soon to be an archaic concept and people should identify primarily at a municipal level. Its been said that NYC could produce 85% of it's own food using the right technology. I'm interning at a local organic..."farm" for lack of a better word and god damn, regulations are a real barrier to hatching this new paradigm.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because agricultural regulations are written in order to squash competition from

small producers. The book, Everything I want to do is Illegal by Joel Salatan is an excellent read on this subject. Another is Small is Beautiful by Schumacher.

Also, the principle of organizing society at the municipal level is the bedrock of Bookchin's Libertarian Municipalism, which is based on the popular anarchist notion of decentralization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, July 4th, 2016 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: How to believe in rebirth

Content:

davidbrainerd said:

the immaterial mind (which you could just as well call 'soul') is the self.

Malcolm wrote:

The mind is one of the aggregates. So when you say "the aggregates are not the self," you are directly contradicting yourself.

davidbrainerd said:

Its not as simple as that. There are clearly two minds. In Pali you have nama and citta

Malcolm wrote:

Nama, citta, vijñāna and manas are all synonyms for the same thing, one's mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 2nd, 2016 at 9:24 PM

Title: Re: How to believe in rebirth

Content:

smcj said:

Hey, this is Mahayanaland. We can say the 8th consciousness goes from lifetime to lifetime. It's not a "self" because it is infinitely mutable.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a self because it is just a name for the aggregate of consciousness and because it is momentary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 2nd, 2016 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: How to believe in rebirth

Content:

davidbrainerd said:

the immaterial mind (which you could just as well call 'soul') is the self.

Malcolm wrote:

The mind is one of the aggregates. So when you say "the aggregates are not the self," you are directly contradicting yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 2nd, 2016 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: To Free Trade or Not to Free Trade

Content:

Queequeg said:

The issue of free trade is becoming a major issue in the US presidential election.

Malcolm wrote:

Free for whom?

Queequeg said:

and even Hilary has been pushed to oppose the Trans Pacific Partnership pact in her primary race with Bernie.

Malcolm wrote:

The DNC rejected all of Sander's platform suggestions. The DNC and the Dems can go screw themselves (actually they are, and screwing the planet and all living creatures in the bargain).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 2nd, 2016 at 4:15 AM

Title: Re: Padmasambhava in Translation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing wrong in principle with the 84000 project.

dzogchungpa said:

I'm sure DJKR will be very relieved to hear this.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I have understood for some time that his every move really does hang on my opinion of it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 2nd, 2016 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: Padmasambhava in Translation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Who cares what other people think?

MalaBeads said:

DJKR cares what other people think.

Or at least he used to.

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing wrong in principle with the 84000 project. What I object to is the idea that the literary products of Tibetan buddhas is inferior in quality and kind to that of Indian buddhas. It is similar to the tale of Padampa Sangye and Milarepa's meeting. While equal in realization, Mila's blade of grass bent a little lower than Padampa's, ostensible due to Mila's inferior birth as a Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 2nd, 2016 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"Political campaigns are not social movements. Even great campaigns like those of Jackson in the 80s, Obama in the recent past or Sanders today are not social movements. We must distinguish between social momentums, social rebellions and social movements. Given the massive national security state and the pervasive carceral state, social movements are rare – past, present and future. The American Empire is more ripe for a counter-revolution than revolution, for right-wing movements than left-wing ones. This is so primarily because of the deep xenophobic roots in the country and profound militaristic sentiments in the culture. Hence, progressive social momentums and chaotic social rebellions are more likely to reshape our priorities and gain some concessions from greedy elites and callous citizens. This is why moral and spiritual dimensions of social activism are crucial – to sustain our will to fight inside and outside the system with little chance of immediate victory!"

http://www.blackagendareport.com/cornel_west_on_rightwing_danger

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 2nd, 2016 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: First Do No Harm

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

All Western doctors, Buddhist or not, take this oath of harmlessness as their priority in treating patients. I wonder how they handle gender dysphoria in children?

Here is one doctor's view:

<http://www.jpands.org/vol21no2/cretella.pdf>

Her conclusion:

Gender dysphoria (GD) in children is a term used to describe a psychological condition in which a child experiences marked incongruence between his experienced gender and the gender associated with his biological sex. There is no rigorous scientific evidence that GD is an innate trait. Moreover, 80 percent to 95 percent of children with GD accept the reality of their biological sex and achieve emotional health by late adolescence.

The treatment of GD in childhood with hormones effectively amounts to mass experimentation on, and sterilization of, youth who are cognitively incapable of providing informed consent. There is a serious ethical problem with allowing irreversible, life-changing procedures to be performed on minors who are too young to give valid consent themselves.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed. Minors should not be allowed to embark on hormones therapy to emulate their preferred (for the time being) gender identity. Physically altering one's body is a decision that should be left to adults.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 2nd, 2016 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Padmasambhava in Translation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

from this perspective, he is saying his teachings are superior to translations.

Astus said:

But I assume hardly anyone today would think that a Westerner's similar statement would amount to anything serious. And if there were a group of students who followed such a living buddha, they'd be considered unorthodox and cult-like.

Malcolm wrote:

Who cares what other people think?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, July 2nd, 2016 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Guru Yoga & Lamanism: Speculations on Shingon and Nichiren Schools

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

So then Tertons are really speaking with GP's voice? Aren't terma written in dakini script and translated by the Tertons into Tibetan? I've always assumed there was some interpretive translating, because let's be honest, dakini can't be that close to Tibetan. And I always thought it was weird that dakini so would quote such large portions of texts.

I guess dakinis read a lot.

heart said:

They are not translating, the text comes out in Tibetan from the the dakini letters (that often just are a few syllables) . You can read about it in Dilgo Khyentses biography and ChNNR's "The crystal and the way of the light".

/magnus

Crazywisdom said:

So dakini letters come out in ones native language. Still, GP put it down in dakini.

Malcolm wrote:

Not exactly. Guru Rinpoche taught the teachings in full, in Tibetan. The Dakinī scripts are are keys used to unlock the memory of tertön, who then writes down what he recalls of the teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 1st, 2016 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Padmasambhava in Translation

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

This is actually an interesting point. Strictly from a historical POV or whatever, is it clear that Padmasambhava knew Tibetan well? Apparently some say he only spent about 6 months in Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

Was Padmasambhava a nirmanakāya? If so, do you think he need to take a TSL class?

tomamundsen said:

My own teacher doesn't teach this way, but in the book Essence of Buddhism, Traleg Kyabgon Rinpoche said that the Buddha's omniscience does not mean he literally knows everything and that he'd have to learn French, for example. I don't have the actual citation on hand, unfortunately. I guess there's different opinions on the matter?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 1st, 2016 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: Padmasambhava in Translation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Since Padmasambhava taught in Tibetan ...

dzogchungpa said:

This is actually an interesting point. Strictly from a historical POV or whatever, is it clear that Padmasambhava knew Tibetan well? Apparently some say he only spent about 6 months in Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

Was Padmasambhava a nirmanakāya? If so, do you think he need to take a TSL class?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 1st, 2016 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Astus said:

"By the same token, it seems unlikely that those in these regions (or Cornwall or other economically peripheral spaces) would feel 'grateful' to the EU for subsidies. Knowing that your business, farm, family or region is dependent on the beneficence of wealthy liberals is unlikely to be a recipe for satisfaction (see James Meek's recent essay in the London Review of Books on Europhobic farmers who receive vast subsidies from the EU). More bizarrely, it has since emerged that regions with the closest economic ties to the EU in general (and not just of the subsidised variety) were most likely to vote Leave. While it may be one thing for an investment banker to understand that they 'benefit from the EU' in regulatory terms, it is quite another to encourage poor and culturally marginalised people to feel grateful towards the elites that sustain them through handouts, month by month. Resentment develops not in spite of this generosity, but arguably because of it. This isn't to discredit what the EU does in terms of redistribution, but pointing to handouts is a psychologically and politically naïve basis on which to justify remaining in the EU."

(http://www.perc.org.uk/project_posts/thoughts-on-the-sociology-of-brexit/)

treehuggingoctopus said:

Ah, you beat me to it, Astus. A cracking piece.

Johnny Dangerous said:

This kind of attitude exists among liberals in the US too. So many times you will hear people saying that they just can't understand why Tea Partiers, poor whites on welfare etc. who might receive Social Security or other benefits "vote against their own interests", in both cases it assumes that simply receiving subsidies would somehow ingratiate a group towards a certain side..but it rarely works like that. If it did, corporations would be ingratiated to taxpayers.

During a 9-hour meeting in St. Louis, Missouri on Friday, members of the DNC's platform drafting committee voted down a number of measures proposed by Bernie Sanders surrogates that would have come out against the contentious Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), fracking, and the Israeli occupation of Palestine. At the same time, proposals to support a carbon tax, Single Payer healthcare, and a \$15 minimum wage

tied to inflation were also disregarded.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.commondreams.org/news/2016/06/25/betraying-progressives-dnc-platform-backs-fracking-tpp-and-israel-occupation>

Why would I ever vote for the Democratic Party? Screw the DNC. Guess I will be voting Green again.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 1st, 2016 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Padmasambhava in Translation

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

DJKR on "Lamaism": The Tibetans have developed the habit of preserving and propagating the work of Tibetan lamas, and seem to have forgotten about the Sutras and Shastras. Painful as it is for me to admit, Tibetans often promote the teachings of their own teachers far more than those of the Buddha—and I have no trouble understanding why Tibetan Buddhism is sometimes described as “Lamaism”. Today, as a result, our vision is quite narrow, and instead of dedicating our limited resources to translating the Words of the Buddha, we pour it into translating the teachings of individual lineage gurus, biographies, their long-life prayers, and prayers for the propagation of the teachings of individual schools.
from <http://84000.co/translating-the-words-of-the-buddhadharma-for-hearing-contemplation-and-meditation/>.

Malcolm wrote:

Padmasambhava on translations:

Since this [dkon mchog spyi 'dus] is a teaching by the voice of the dharmakāya or the sambhogakāya, it is superior to the [the teachings] in the languages of India.

The real point is that the voice of a nirmanakāya is the voice of the dharmakāya or the sambhogakāya. Since Padmasambhava taught in Tibetan, from this perspective, he is saying his teachings are superior to translations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, July 1st, 2016 at 12:04 AM

Title: Re: Adi-Buddha on Wikipedia

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Princeton Dictionary of Buddhism says:

"The term seems to appear for the first time in the MAHĀYĀNASŪTRĀLAMKĀRA, where the existence of such a primordial buddha is refuted on the grounds that the achievement of buddhahood is impossible without the accumulation of merit (PUṆYA) and wisdom (JÑĀNA)"

So it appears in sutra, albeit in a negative connotation.

Malcolm wrote:

The term actually is not in this text. What is refuted here, in chapter nine, verse 77, is the primordality of buddhahood, but the term adibuddha is not used here at all.

dzogchungpa said:

I believe it is in the bhashya:

<https://www2.hf.uio.no/polyglotta/index.php?page=record&view=record&vid=85&mid=284072>

Malcolm wrote:

Even so, Vasubandhu is not referring the same concept found in Vajrayāna. And in fact location cited, it is not used, despite Vasubandhu's use of the term.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 30th, 2016 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: Adi-Buddha on Wikipedia

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Princeton Dictionary of Buddhism says:

"The term seems to appear for the first time in the MAHĀYĀNASŪTRĀLAMKĀRA, where the existence of such a primordial buddha is refuted on the grounds that the achievement of buddhahood is impossible without the accumulation of merit (PUṆYA) and wisdom (JÑĀNA)"

So it appears in sutra, albeit in a negative connotation.

Malcolm wrote:

The term actually is not in this text. What is refuted here, in chapter nine, verse 77, is the primordality of buddhahood, but the term adibuddha is not used here at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 30th, 2016 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Adi-Buddha on Wikipedia

Content:

Boomerang said:

Thank you, Victoria. Is it correct now?

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adi-Buddha>

Malcolm wrote:

The term adibuddha does not exist in sutra.

yan kong said:

But in East Asia they do refer to Vairocana as the Primordial Buddha or at least "Universal".

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. but this still is not sūtra. This comes from Mantrayāna. It is a name for the nature of reality, the buddhahood of the basis, i.e., the reality that all buddhas realize.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 29th, 2016 at 4:40 AM

Title: Re: Guru Yoga & Lamanism: Speculations on Shingon and Nichiren Schools

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

DJKR on "Lamaism": The Tibetans have developed the habit of preserving and propagating the work of Tibetan lamas, and seem to have forgotten about the Sutras and Shastras. Painful as it is for me to admit, Tibetans often promote the teachings of their own teachers far more than those of the Buddha—and I have no trouble understanding why Tibetan Buddhism is sometimes described as “Lamaism”. Today, as a result, our vision is quite narrow, and instead of dedicating our limited resources to translating the Words of the Buddha, we pour it into translating the teachings of individual lineage gurus, biographies, their long-life prayers, and prayers for the propagation of the teachings of individual schools.

from <http://84000.co/translated-the-words-of-the-buddhadharma-for-hearing-contemplation-and-meditation/>.

Malcolm wrote:

Padmasambhava on translations:

Since this [dkon mchog spyi 'dus] is a teaching by the voice of the dharmakāya or the sambhogakāya, it is superior to the [the teachings] in the languages of India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2016 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Guru Yoga & Lamanism: Speculations on Shingon and Nichiren Schools

Content:

Fortyeightvows said:

I'm thinking that the author of the article is a member of this forum...

And personally I'm fond of the term lamaism A lot of great English books use the term: Kenneth Che'en, Laurence Waddell, Walter Eugene Clark, Evan Wentz I guess peculiar reference library may be right...

Malcolm wrote:

Waddell's book is an example of the worst sort of 19th century bigotry and racism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2016 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Unusual form of Phurba

Content:

dzoki said:

The deity in the picture looks like a retinue deity to me, not the main deity,

Malcolm wrote:

I agree, it is clearly from the bottom of a thangka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2016 at 8:38 PM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Dzogchen

Content:

Kilaya. said:

I've seen this translation myself in a book written by Lama Ole Nydahl. I wonder what the literal translation of "drollö" is?

Malcolm wrote:

It comes from a joke made by Trungpa. Gro bo lod is a corruption of the term krodhalokottarra.

Kilaya. said:

Krodhalokottara means something like "angry lord of the world", right?

Malcolm wrote:

It means "transcendent (beyond the world) wrath."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2016 at 7:46 PM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Drolo is means total integration. When you are totally integrated, everything becomes your servant.

Fa Dao said:

I saw another translation I thought was odd "Vajra Sagging Belly"...thoughts?

Kilaya. said:

I've seen this translation myself in a book written by Lama Ole Nydahl. I wonder what the literal translation of "drollö" is?

Malcolm wrote:

It comes from a joke made by Trungpa. Gro bo lod is a corruption of the term krodhalokottara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2016 at 10:32 AM

Title: Re: Dorje Drolo and Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Drollo is means total integration. When you are totally integrated, everything becomes your servant.

Fa Dao said:

I saw another translation I thought was odd "Vajra Sagging Belly"...thoughts?

Malcolm wrote:

Completely wrong.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2016 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that would be a fair comparison is the leave vote was a clear mandate, but it wasn't. And, it is not a binding vote (which every one seems to forget). As long as the UK does not trigger article 50, they are in the EU still.

Astus said:

And how do you imagine they could disregard the referendum in the parliament? It might have worse consequences then leaving.

Malcolm wrote:

Ah, because it is parliament, and because it is pretty clear that no one actually has the stomach to leave the EU. Recall that there were 3 million+ signatures within 48 hours demanding a second referendum. If young people had turned out in higher numbers, the remain party would have won.

Basically, Cameron played this one badly.

Astus said:

If Boris Johnson looked downbeat yesterday, that is because he realises that he has lost.

Perhaps many Brexiters do not realise it yet, but they have actually lost, and it is all down to one man: David Cameron.

With one fell swoop yesterday at 9:15 am, Cameron effectively annulled the referendum result, and simultaneously destroyed the political careers of Boris Johnson, Michael Gove and leading Brexiters who cost him so much anguish, not to mention his premiership.

How?

Throughout the campaign, Cameron had repeatedly said that a vote for leave would lead to triggering Article 50 straight away. Whether implicitly or explicitly, the image was clear: he would be giving that notice under Article 50 the morning after a vote to leave. Whether that was scaremongering or not is a bit moot now but, in the midst of the sentimental nautical references of his speech yesterday, he quietly abandoned that position and handed the responsibility over to his successor.

And as the day wore on, the enormity of that step started to sink in: the markets, Sterling, Scotland, the Irish border, the Gibraltar border, the frontier at Calais, the need to continue compliance with all EU regulations for a free market, re-issuing passports, Brits abroad, EU citizens in Britain, the mountain of legislation to be torn up and rewritten ... the list grew and grew.

The referendum result is not binding. It is advisory. Parliament is not bound to commit itself in that same direction.

The Conservative party election that Cameron triggered will now have one question looming over it: will you, if elected as party leader, trigger the notice under Article 50?

Who will want to have the responsibility of all those ramifications and consequences on his/her head and shoulders?

Boris Johnson knew this yesterday, when he emerged subdued from his home and was even more subdued at the press conference. He has been out-manoeuvred and check-mated.

If he runs for leadership of the party, and then fails to follow through on triggering Article 50, then he is finished. If he does not run and effectively abandons the field, then he is finished. If he runs, wins and pulls the UK out of the EU, then it will all be over - Scotland will break away, there will be upheaval in Ireland, a recession ... broken trade agreements. Then he is also finished. Boris Johnson knows all of this. When he acts like the dumb blond it is just that: an act.

The Brexit leaders now have a result that they cannot use. For them, leadership of the Tory party has become a poison chalice.

When Boris Johnson said there was no need to trigger Article 50 straight away, what he

really meant to say was "never". When Michael Gove went on and on about "informal negotiations" ... why? why not the formal ones straight away? ... he also meant not triggering the formal departure. They both know what a formal demarche would mean: an irreversible step that neither of them is prepared to take.

All that remains is for someone to have the guts to stand up and say that Brexit is unachievable in reality without an enormous amount of pain and destruction, that cannot be borne. And David Cameron has put the onus of making that statement on the heads of the people who led the Brexit campaign.

Malcolm wrote:

http://indy100.independent.co.uk/article/people-are-really-really-hoping-this-theory-about-david-cameron-and-brex-it-is-true--bJhqBql0VZ?utm_source=indy&utm_medium=top5&utm_campaign=i100

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2016 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I was referring to the all the sturm and drung leading up to the vote.

But also from the second article you posted:

But politicians are talking tough. Concessions, they say, might encourage other member states to leave. For this reason one senior MP told me: "There must be consequences for Britain".

Astus said:

Well, it seems Merkel couldn't hold out against everyone else:

<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/article-50-brex-it-eu-referendum-result-german-eu-latest-news-leave-european-union-a7105946.html>

BTW, it's like when someone says that he wants a divorce but then procrastinates in leaving the house and doing the official paperwork.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, that would be a fair comparison is the leave vote was a clear mandate, but it wasn't. And, it is not a binding vote (which every one seems to forget). As long as the UK does not trigger article 50, they are in the EU still.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2016 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Unknown said:

But we can be sure of one thing: All negative economic trends will now be blamed on Brexit and the populist “mob” who brought it on, rather than on the establishment’s neoliberal policies which are actually responsible.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.counterpunch.org/2016/06/27/brexit-establishment-freak-out/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2016 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

DGA said:

For anti-austerity, anti-capitalist voters: When you have the likes of LePen cheering you on and gloating over your success, and when the UKIP is your ally, you have to ask yourself if what you are doing is working the way you want.

Malcolm wrote:

POI:

#Lexit: The Left Leave Campaign

On June 23, Britain will vote in a referendum on EU membership. Voters deserve better than an ugly choice between David Cameron’s pro-EU campaign (or the pipe-dream of a “Social Europe”) on the one hand, and the reactionary anti-EU campaigning of UKIP and the Tory right on the other.

That is why we have come together to launch #Lexit: The Left Leave Campaign. We aim to build a principled, anti-racist and internationalist campaign, committed to democracy, social justice and environmental sustainability.

Why you should vote to leave on 23 June:

(1) A big business agenda

The EU is in secret negotiations with the US to launch the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). This will promote privatisation and reduce corporate standards to the lowest level either side of the Atlantic. War on Want estimates the deal could cost 600,000 jobs.

Membership of the EU hampers any attempt to nationalise the railways or to rescue industries such as steel where jobs are threatened.

Countries such as Greece, Cyprus, Ireland and Portugal have suffered brutal EU austerity programmes. In Greece, health spending fell by a quarter, education by a third.

(2) Unreformable and undemocratic

Decision-making in the EU is dominated by unelected bodies such as the European Commission and European Central Bank. Those running them are contemptuous of

democracy. Confronted with discontent over TTIP, Cecilia Malmström, European trade commissioner, replied: "I do not take my mandate from the European people." Rewriting or scrapping the basic EU treaties would need unanimous agreement between all 28 governments.

(3) Rights and justice

It is a myth that the EU defends workers. Equal pay legislation came out of the struggle of the women sewing machinists at Ford Dagenham in 1968, not from the EU. Most health and safety legislation originates in the 1970s, a time of union strength. The national minimum wage was won by the labour movement—not given to us by the EU. The EU has not defended workers against any of the 12 Tory anti-union laws since 1980. The left defends the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) adopted by the Council of Europe, a completely separate body from the EU that Britain would remain a member of whatever the referendum result.

(4) Fortress Europe

The so-called freedom of movement of labour does not apply to non-EU citizens. For those from within the EU, four European Court of Justice rulings have outlawed trade union and government action to enforce equal rights for imported ("posted") workers. Now the EU is engaged in the mass deportation of refugees from Greece. Amnesty International says of the deportation programme, "The very principle of international protection for those fleeing war and persecution is at stake." We defend the rights of refugees.

"Fortress Europe" is also developing a military dimension, which EU treaties openly link to Nato.

(5) Heading right?

If Britain votes to leave, it won't automatically mean a move to the right. The Tories are being torn apart by debate over the EU. If Cameron loses, he will almost certainly go. If a Conservative government survives, it will be hopelessly fragile.

Not only will the government be weakened. The rich and powerful overwhelmingly support British membership. The City, the Confederation of British Industry and the Institute of Directors all support the status quo. So do at least two-thirds of large British firms surveyed by the Financial Times last year. A crisis for our rulers can open up a greater space for the left.

<http://www.leftleave.org/about-2/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2016 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

DGA said:

For anti-austerity, anti-capitalist voters: When you have the likes of LePen cheering you on and gloating over your success, and when the UKIP is your ally, you have to ask yourself if what you are doing is working the way you want.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Wall Street was vehemently against Leave, does that mean by extension that all people who supported Remain or "an ally of Wall Street"?

Malcolm wrote:

Financial markets don't like uncertainty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2016 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts

Content:

Vasana said:

Florin - if you say the Dharmakaya is conditioned, you are saying it is composite.

florin said:

Dharmakaya teachers are our dzogchen teachers.

Malcolm wrote:

Really? Who says?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2016 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Myoho-Nameless said:

We Americans are a bipolar and emotional people...

Malcolm wrote:

Speak for yourself, I am neither bipolar nor emotive. I am a Yankee.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 28th, 2016 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The EU's approach has not been, "UK we'll miss you," but rather, "You fools, you will regret this." Not a very appealing message.

Astus said:

<http://www.reuters.com/article/us-britain-eu-germany-rethink-idUSKCN0ZC0IB>

<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-36630326>

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I was referring to the all the sturm and drung leading up to the vote.

But also from the second article you posted:

But politicians are talking tough. Concessions, they say, might encourage other member states to leave. For this reason one senior MP told me: "There must be consequences for Britain".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 27th, 2016 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

DGA said:

For anti-austerity, anti-capitalist voters: When you have the likes of LePen cheering you on and gloating over your success, and when the UKIP is your ally, you have to ask yourself if what you are doing is working the way you want.

Malcolm wrote:

Similar conditions existed in the twenties and thirties, when fascists and socialists often voiced similar positions but for vastly different reasons. The difference of course is that as soon as the fascists took power in Italy, etc., all pretenses about opposing capitalism faded swiftly as capitalism used fascist parties's nationalism.

In any event, people who are freaked out by Brexit in the UK have themselves to blame. This whole thing was staged by Cameron and it blew up in his face. He tried to use the Brexit vote very much the same way he manipulated the Scottish Independence referendum.

I imagine though, that there is serious backpedaling going on, but all this shows is just how tenuous the EU's hold is. The EU's approach has not been, "UK we'll miss you," but rather, "You fools, you will regret this." Not a very appealing message.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 27th, 2016 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: where in america are nyingma retreat centers?

Content:

jay88 said:

Im looking to buy some land back home in the States to build a home and practice . I would like to buy land near a Nyingma retreat center or temple preferably but the main thing ish to be able to stay in close contact with a Sangha and teachers. I want my

family to be able to practice and be raised in an area influenced by the Dharma. So if any one can recommend a few temples or retreat centers or communities in the states it would help me out a lot. Anywhere in the states is fine . Thank you all

Malcolm wrote:

Colorado, California, Oregon, Upstate New York., these are the main places where you find such temples and centers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 27th, 2016 at 9:42 AM

Title: Re: Adi-Buddha on Wikipedia

Content:

Boomerang said:

Thank you, Victoria. Is it correct now?

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adi-Buddha>

In Vajrayana Buddhism, the ādibuddha (Tibetan: dang-po'i sangs-rgyas), is the "First Buddha." The term reemerges in tantric literature, most prominently in the Kalachakra.[1] According to the first interpretation, ādi means “first” such that the ādibuddha was the first to attain Buddhahood.[2] According to the second interpretation, ādi means “primordial,” not referring to a person but to an innate wisdom that is present in all sentient beings.[3] In Tibetan Buddhism, the term ādibuddha is often used to describe Samantabhadra or Vajradhara.[4] In East Asia, the ādibuddha is typically considered to be Vairocana.[5]

Malcolm wrote:

The term adibuddha does not exist in sutra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 27th, 2016 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Astus said:

It seems so strange to me that those who would support Bernie in the US can at the same time rejoice over and approve Brexit. Is it not apparent enough that with Brexit the right wing, especially far-right politics won?

Malcolm wrote:

The American Left in general supported Brexit, because it represents the failure of neoliberalism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2016 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Bristollad said:

The EU was seriously flawed and undemocratic...

Malcolm wrote:

Democracy and the uncertainty that comes along with it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2016 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Fa Dao said:

is hillary really the lesser of two evils??? I simply cannot bring myself to vote for her..period.

Malcolm wrote:

Still Sanders.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2016 at 9:35 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Wayfarer said:

There are also big areas of disadvantage in the USA, with the middle-class incomes stagnating and the drying up of opportunities.

But the question is, will leaving the European Union actually make any difference to those circumstances for the working poor of England?

In all of the rhetoric from the Leave campaigners, I can't recall anything concrete about the economic benefits of separation from the EU. It is all angry talk about 'taking our country back' and 'stopping foreigners from taking our jobs'.

I think there are some powerful forces around who have worked out how to capture that anger and direct it for their own purposes. One of the main backers of the Leave campaign was profiled in the Australian papers yesterday, he is a billionaire businessman. Chump said leaving the EU was 'fantastic', and I have a strong urge to be suspicious of anything that Chump thinks is 'fantastic'. Most of what Chump thinks is 'fantastic' is really tied to what he thinks he can make money out of. After all, for Chump, the only really fantastic thing is money.

So I'm much more suspicious of these string-pulling back-room business types than the so-called 'EU Beaureacrats'. In Western society, business outguns beauracracy all the

time. A lot of the talk about 'the evils of government' from right-wingers, is so that they can dismantle the regulations that stop them from concentrating yet more wealth in their hands.

And I think all this talk about 'the people taking their country back' is very sad. The fish and chip shop owners and unemployed parents won't be any better off as a result, after the euphoria of 'independence day' has passed, and the placards are all put away, I can't see how there will be any economic benefits for them. It's all pseudo-patriotic sloganeering, as far as I can see.

Malcolm wrote:

In the end, it is about the austerity programs the EU and its bankers keep shoving down its member countries' throats.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2016 at 9:16 AM

Title: Re: Ngakpa tradition & magic

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Mamiwhata?

Malcolm wrote:

It is a kind of nāgā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2016 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Adi-Buddha on Wikipedia

Content:

Boomerang said:

In Buddhist context, the Adi-Buddha is the "Primordial Buddha." This refers to a self-emanating, self-originating Buddha, present before anything else existed.

Malcolm wrote:

This is also wrong.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 26th, 2016 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: Adi-Buddha on Wikipedia

Content:

smcj said:

It is in fact completely wrong.

Ok, so are you going to edit it?

Malcolm wrote:
Not my job.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2016 at 11:57 PM
Title: Re: Adi-Buddha on Wikipedia
Content:

Boomerang said:
I wonder if this is a little bit misleading.

Malcolm wrote:
It is in fact completely wrong.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2016 at 9:56 PM
Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
Jill Stein weighs in on Brexit:
The vote in Britain to exit the European Union (EU) is a victory for those who believe in the right of self-determination and who reject the pro-corporate, austerity policies of the political elites in EU. The vote says no to the EU's vision of a world run by and for big business. It is also a rejection of the European political elite and their contempt for ordinary people.

Unfortunately, the rejection was also motivated by attacks on immigrants and refugees, which must be opposed. That is a defeat.
http://www.jill2016.com/stein_calls_britain_vote_a_wake_up_call

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2016 at 7:35 PM
Title: Re: Natural Luminosity
Content:

Temiccio said:
I'm not entirely sure. In the Milindapanha for example, it is said that the characteristic mark of wisdom (which I assume to be panna) is "illuminating". Immediately thereafter it says that when wisdom arises in the mind, it either makes the radiance of knowledge shine forth, or it causes the light of knowledge to arise (the two translations I have differ as to which of these is done by knowledge and which by vision). The Dvedhavitakka

compares each of the tevijja to light, but whether this can be generalized to vidya as a whole is uncertain. Page 121 of Nanamoli's Patisambhidamagga, in which knowledge is discussed, compares knowledge (of the 4NT) to light.

Malcolm wrote:

The vidyā discussed in the Pali canon is not the vidyā discussed in Dzogchen.

Temicco said:

The term I am translating as luminosity is 'od gsal (ābhāsvara/prabhāsvara).

That specific term may only come up in contexts discussing purity. Again, however, I see no reason why it couldn't play multiple connotative roles.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a translation issue-- Tibetan is a synonym poor language, compared to Sanskrit. But there is no cross over between luminosity as ultimate purity of phenomena and usages of the term where it actually means light.

Temicco said:

Is clarity phenomenologically luminous? The passage is quite explicit.

Malcolm wrote:

The Chinese, in the context noted above, translate ābhāsvara/prabhāsvara as purity. Clarity refers to the open space of the mind, which receives impressions.

Temicco said:

Well yeah, I do say they're different. I'm doubtful that connotation and polysemy didn't creep into the terms used. Especially when only two of the quotes you posted are absolutely clear that a reductive interpretation of prabhasvara is accurate.

Malcolm wrote:

Context is everything. But you are trying to match terms from four different languages, in several traditions all at once. This is just going to cause you confusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2016 at 10:07 AM

Title: Re: How to believe in rebirth

Content:

Boomerang said:

I've believed in rebirth longer than I've believed in Buddhism. Still, I feel that I could believe in rebirth more. Then I would have more samvega and bodhicitta.

Astus said:

If you accept rebirth and you want to improve your motivation, contemplate the six realms and the drawbacks of samsara.

Boomerang said:

I've been trying to do that, visualizing myself burning, freezing, being eaten alive, and so on. That was what prompted me to start this thread. The more I do it the less serious it seems, like I'm just imagining a fantasy. So then I thought, "I must not believe in rebirth enough."

I think the contemplations also make me neurotically self-critical and pessimistic. In fact, reading over Words of My Perfect Teacher, it seems like Patrul Rinpoche encourages readers to contemplate the faults of samsara until they are complete neurotic messes who never want to smile or sleep.

Malcolm wrote:

WOMPT is a masterpiece of Tibetan literature, and it has a pointed sense of humor in Tibetan difficult to emulate in English. Its tone should be read as dry, sardonic and ironically amused when it comes to samsara, and ecstatic when it comes to the oath and its result.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2016 at 9:59 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

If anybody wanted to argue that we are far from ready for participatory democracy, here is the ammo:

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-switch/wp/2016/06/24/the-british-are-frantically-googling-what-the-eu-is-hours-after-voting-to-leave-it/>

Malcolm wrote:

Democracy includes the right to make poor decisions, as well as the obligation to cope with them. Hopefully, people learn from their errors.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2016 at 4:54 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Unknown said:

So what started as a gamble by David Cameron on an outlet for domestic British discontent, to be used as a lever to bargain with Brussels for a few more favors, has metastasized into an astonishing political earthquake about the dis-integration of the European Union.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.counterpunch.org/2016/06/24/why-the-uk-said-bye-bye-to-the-eu/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2016 at 2:26 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

¡Basta Ya, Brussels! British Voters Reject EU Corporate Slavestate:

The EU has shown that it is as incapable of reform as it is of accepting responsibility for perpetuating a financial crisis that began 7 years ago and persists to this very day. It has also demonstrated repeatedly that it will not hesitate to inflict as much economic pain as possible on its victims unless they comply with its counterproductive edicts. Worst of all, the strict rules of the EU make it impossible for state representatives to follow the will of their people or to act in a way that serves their own national interests. Any deviation from Brussel's neoliberal consensus is likely to end up before the European Court of Justice where the mega corporations have the upper hand. By leaving the EU, Britain will restore its sovereignty and strengthen its democracy.

<http://www.counterpunch.org/2016/06/24/basta-ya-brussels-british-voters-reject-eu-corporate-slavestate/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2016 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Now no type of governance is perfect is promoting freeing ethics and opposing captivity producing vice, but Communism plainly hates freedom and prefers a slavish populace.

Malcolm wrote:

So does Walmart, McDonald's, etc., so what to do?

China has much stricter rules about porn and so on than we do, and is really a Confucian society with barely a veneer of Communism left. etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2016 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Ngakpa tradition & magic

Content:

Karinos said:

I remember Lama Dawa Chhodak Rinpoche explaining in simple language that "those who hold mantra" and those who received hair Troma empowerment are "baby ngakpas". Ultimately one should complete Maha, Anu, Atiyoga paths and receive 100 special empowerments of Zhitro deities - placing each deity in body of disciple. Only

then one can be called Ngakpa (with capital N).

but maybe my memory is crooked

Malcolm wrote:

Different Lamas have different ideas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2016 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That very much depends on which one of the five Samantabhadra's one is discussing. But in general here we are discussing the adibuddha who attained liberation without engaging in an iota of virtue.

White Lotus said:

beautiful. this thread is really quite something! i begin to understand what you Dzogchenpas and Mahamudrins mean by "non duality" or "non judgement". its not my style, but still i can see the truth in this approach. i would say that one should be free to practice virtue or non virtue as ones conscience dictates. just to naturally be an ordinary person, or if one chooses: extraordinary. freedom to say no or yes as one naturally would. to see the virtue for example in a buddha's anger, or impatience is liberating.

best wishes, Tom.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not what is meant by the above. Samantabhadra achieved buddhahood prior to the split between samsara and nirvana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 25th, 2016 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Kaccāni said:

You really could advance from destruction to deconstruction.

Malcolm wrote:

Ugggh, talk about poseurs, Derrida is the worst.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Reasons to remain anti-communist:

<http://blog.victimsofcommunism.org/ten-reasons-why-we-must-remain-anti-communists/>

Malcolm wrote:

I am not against antiquated nineteenth century politics no one practices anymore. There are other more pressing issues.

Nicholas Weeks said:

Looks like you did not read the piece closely. One of the key graphs is this one:
I am an anti-communist because I value freedom not because the people who suppress such freedoms call themselves communists. If we are truly anti-communists, we must recognize and communicate to others that the victory over communism will be possible only if there is a victory over all the forms of human oppression that are associated not just with communism but with other political systems as well.
Buddha said his Dharma had one taste - the taste of freedom. Did he mean only freedom from spiritual ignorance, personal craving, anger etc? I think not.

Malcolm wrote:

I doubt very much he had neoliberalism in mind...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Unknown said:

"Democracy" means nothing else other than, "rule of the people", in Greek. There is nothing democratic about the political concepts of the United States and Europe. And there is absolutely nothing democratic about the "global arrangement" through which the West has been ruling over the rest of the world for decades and centuries. The second part is, I'm convinced, much more important, much more devastating; in the West, people have been tolerating their insane political system, in exchange for the countless privileges they are getting from their countries' plundering of the planet, and violating entire nations and continents. But in Africa, Asia and elsewhere, those "un-people" have no choice at all.

Malcolm wrote:

<https://www.sott.net/article/320734-Russia-and-China-are-hated-because-they-are-protecting-humanity-from-Western-terror-Interview-with-Andre->

Vltchek?utm_content=bufferf8938&utm_medium=social&utm_source=facebook.com&utm_campaign=buffer

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Kaccāni said:

So you're pro promiting causes by fostering racism among the working class?

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahaha, I have not fostered any such thing. Racism is a symptom of Europe's dysfunction, not the cause of it.

Anders mentioned free movement of labor, well, when you have a house, your kids are in school and so on, it is pretty hard to just pick and move for a new job somewhere else. Labor mobility favors the young, not the established, married, mortgaged life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Reasons to remain anti-communist:

<http://blog.victimsofcommunism.org/ten-reasons-why-we-must-remain-anti-communists/>

Malcolm wrote:

I am not against antiquated nineteenth century politics no one practices anymore. There are other more pressing issues.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Kaccāni said:

I'm closer living to the consequences of it, involved in that game. So your concern is duly noted.

Malcolm wrote:

We live on one (suffering) planet, and the solution is not hegemonic economies as we have had for the past 70 years. The solution is increased decentralization of power and

economies, and increased investment in clean energies, etc.

We do not live in a world any longer where issues in Europe do not affect the US, etc. we live in a world where everything is too tightly wound, and where that which appears to benefit Americans and Europeans really is just temporary gain, until corporation x, y, or z decides to move to Timbuktu where labor is a pittance.

Europe is swiftly moving to a heavily entrenched class-based society based on ethnic origin with Africans and refugees at the bottom, and traditional nationals at the top of the heap.

You are now beginning to experience what America went through with all the mass immigrations from Europe during the late nineteenth and early Twentieth centuries. You are looking at 100 years years of trying to figure out how to integrate not only former colonies, but also economic and other refugees. You are a wealthy block of nations that many people in the world want a chunk of, understandably.

People think Americans are racists — I have encountered the most astonishing xenophobia and racism ever in my life among European Buddhists. Ole Nydahl is tame compared to some of the amazing stuff I have heard.

Radical change is upon us, we are heading into a period of intense world instability. If we manage survive without some lunatic setting off nukes, it will be amazing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Anders said:

This is a terrible outcome.

I don't think people appreciate what a landmark the free movement of labour really is.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not really a free movement of labor. It is actually the free movement of corporations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Kaccāni said:

The decision came by a narrow margin. Supposedly the xenophobic propaganda made that possible. Trying to duck the backfire of the colonies. And the old voted over the youngs.

So that "independence" is born upon a racial-religious defilement (they weren't in the currency union in the first place).
That makes it an opposition, not a liberty.

Ye Buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

While the vote may have been carried for the wrong reasons (Boris Johnson, etc.) it was the right way to go. Now Scotland is sure to leave the UK...something Cameron tried to prevent.

Anders said:

Surely you are in favour of this, seeing as you prefer local governance.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, absolutely. I was disappointed when Scotland did not manage to bust out of the UK.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Kaccāni said:

More jobs can be doubted. More well-paid jobs can be doubted even more.

Are we going to re-establish border controls in Northern Ireland now? Basically, the border security, which has been raised as an anti-EU argument, are governed by the Schengen-Treaty. Britain never ratified it. Still going to tolerate it? That would be against the spirit of separatism ...

And what about U.K. citizens who founded families and living in Europe because of labour mobility within the EU? (Northern Ireland probably again is the biggest issue). Are they being sent back "home"?

And what about EU citizens who founded families in Britain, because of the same? Are they being sent back "home"?

Before all, it appears a victory for sophist demagogues, creating an illusiory justification for Segregation.

Best wishes

Kc

Malcolm wrote:

Get over it. Things change: times change, economies change, nations change. Everyone will manage, the sky is not falling.

I find it somewhat amazing that people who are nominally left in Europe so enthusiastically favor policies which originate from the Chicago School of Economics and the American Right:

Neo-liberalism would accept the nineteenth century liberal emphasis on the fundamental importance of the individual, but it would substitute for the nineteenth century goal of laissez- faire as a means to this end, the goal of the competitive order. It would seek to use competition among producers to protect consumers from exploitation, competition among employers to protect workers and owners of property, and competition among consumers to protect the enterprises themselves. The state would police the system, establish conditions favorable to competition and prevent monopoly, provide a stable monetary framework, and relieve acute misery and distress. The citizens would be protected against the state by the existence of a free private market; and against one another by the preservation of competition.

And:

It is essential, however, that the performance of this function involve the minimum of interference with the market. There is justification for subsidizing people because they are poor, whether they are farmers or city-dwellers, young or old. There is no justification for subsidizing farmers as farmers rather than because they are poor. There is justification in trying to achieve a minimum income for all; there is no justification for setting a minimum wage and thereby increasing the number of people without income; there is no justification for trying to achieve a minimum consumption of bread separately, meat separately, and so on.

Milton Friedman, from Neo-Liberalism and its Prospects

(http://0055d26.netsolhost.com/friedman/pdfs/other_commentary/Farmand.02.17.1951.pdf)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 7:45 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Kaccāni said:

The decision came by a narrow margin. Supposedly the xenophobic propaganda made that possible. Trying to duck the backfire of the colonies. And the old voted over the youngs.

So that "independence" is born upon a racial-religious defilement (they weren't in the currency union in the first place).

That makes it an opposition, not a liberty.

Ye Buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

While the vote may have been carried for the wrong reasons (Boris Johnson, etc.) it was the right way to go. Now Scotland is sure to leave the UK...something Cameron tried to prevent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 7:42 PM

Title: Re: Natural Luminosity

Content:

Temicco said:

In other contexts luminosity means a knowing capacity, or sometimes even just the experience of something akin to light.

Malcolm wrote:

Citations from original sources, i.e., primary texts?

Temicco said:

Vidya, at the very least, is compared to light that illuminates objects in the Dvedhavitakka sutta, the Milindapanha, and the Patisambhidamagga, among others.

Malcolm wrote:

Vijjā, in Pali Buddhist texts, as far as I know, does not have the connotation you are here ascribing to it. Are you certain you are not conflating this with another term?

Temicco said:

Prajna gets wrapped up in the metaphor inasmuch as it is related to vidya, and is said to be illuminative by Bankei.

Malcolm wrote:

The term I am translating as luminosity is 'od gsal (ābhāsvara/prabhāsvara).

Temicco said:

The sermons of Bodhidharma describe the mind as a kind of light which makes the world look as if in daylight.

Malcolm wrote:

This is clarity, gsal ba (vivṛta, uttāna, vyakta), not luminosity.

Temicco said:

Obviously not completely literal, but it's interesting. Im just skeptical that a reductive stance regarding the mind's luminosity hits all the connotative bases, even if the contexts and reasons given for luminosity are different between the mind and vidya.

Malcolm wrote:

You are talking about two different things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 10:34 AM

Title: Re: Natural Luminosity

Content:

Temicco said:

In other contexts luminosity means a knowing capacity, or sometimes even just the experience of something akin to light.

Malcolm wrote:

Citations from original sources, i.e., primary texts?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 10:14 AM

Title: Re: Natural Luminosity

Content:

Temicco said:

Just in sutra, or in sutrayana? And setting aside the mind for a moment, the luminosity of prajna and vidya, for instance, isn't just about purity, no?

Malcolm wrote:

One mustn't mix the views of sūtra and tantra. Whatever luminosity means in sūtra, it means something somewhat different in tantra, and something else again in Dzogchen. It is important not to mix these distinctions up.

The tantric usage may overlap with the sūtra usage, and the Dzogchen usage may overlap with the tantra usage, but the reverse is not necessarily the case. In other words, the term becomes progressively multivalent up the scale.

Temicco said:

I'm more asking whether you're sure that luminosity only represents purity in sutra, and whether you mean sutra as in all the sutras, or sutrayana as a whole. I've seen prajna and vidya both be described as luminous in sutrayana because of their knowing capacity. And only two of the sutra quotes you listed support an unequivocal, one-to-one correspondence of purity and luminosity, IMO. I'm not so worried about sutra vs. tantra just yet, although thank you for the heads up.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I am absolutely sure, and yes, all sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 8:18 AM

Title: Re: Natural Luminosity

Content:

Temicco said:

such that if someone comes across a decontextualized line like "the mind is luminous", it may not necessarily be a reference to (only) purity...Surely luminosity can play other

roles? What do you think?

Malcolm wrote:

Not in sūtra. But thanks for taking the time to look at these statements. This is what is stated in sūtra. I just translate as it is in the text.

Temicco said:

Just in sutra, or in sutrayana? And setting aside the mind for a moment, the luminosity of prajna and vidya, for instance, isn't just about purity, no?

Malcolm wrote:

One mustn't mix the views of sūtra and tantra. Whatever luminosity means in sūtra, it means something somewhat different in tantra, and something else again in Dzogchen. It is important not to mix these distinctions up.

The tantric usage may overlap with the sūtra usage, and the Dzogchen usage may overlap with the tantra usage, but the reverse is not necessarily the case. In other words, the term becomes progressively multivalent up the scale.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 8:13 AM

Title: Re: Ngakpa tradition & magic

Content:

Mica said:

But my ongoing quest/ion is - what do people know about magical/occult practice within Dharma, specifically Tibetan Buddhism? How does it fit into practice?

Malcolm wrote:

93/93

I started out a thelemite. Then I understood that Vajrayāna was a nontheistic magickal path. But not only that, I understood that it was actually the swiftest path to liberation. Vajrayāna, and Dzogchen in particular, eclipse the WET tradition in so many ways. But you will only discover that by setting down that path yourself without hesitation or doubt.

Don't look back.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 8:08 AM

Title: Re: How to believe in rebirth

Content:

Rakz said:

Even if there is no rebirth or afterlife the teachings are still beneficial for this lifetime.

Malcolm wrote:

So is golfing (apart from the lumbar injury thing), and maybe more so.

Rakz said:

Could be but I hate golf.

Malcolm wrote:

At least we agree on this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 5:24 AM

Title: Re: How to believe in rebirth

Content:

Rakz said:

Even if there is no rebirth or afterlife the teachings are still beneficial for this lifetime.

Malcolm wrote:

So is golfing (apart from the lumbar injury thing), and maybe more so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: Natural Luminosity

Content:

Temicco said:

such that if someone comes across a decontextualized line like "the mind is luminous", it may not necessarily be a reference to (only) purity...Surely luminosity can play other roles? What do you think?

Malcolm wrote:

Not in sūtra. But thanks for taking the time to look at these statements. This is what is stated in sūtra. I just translate as it is in the text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: Ngakpa tradition & magic

Content:

conebeckham said:

After all, a "Hair Empowerment" is passed from master to student, and this is the definition of lineage.

Malcolm wrote:

Since it is connected with Chö, it means one is a kind of Buddhist sadhu, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

AlexMcLeod said:

I think you're forgetting one very famous example of a person who became enlightened without hearing a Buddha teach. He became a teacher as well. I'll let you think it through.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really into guessing games. If you've someone in mind, please be forthcoming.

smcj said:

I'm gonna guess he's talking about Sakyamuni.

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, I don't play games...and this is not even necessarily true. For example, after Śakyamuni's awakening, according to the Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha tantra, the root tantra of Yoga tantra, there was still something he needed to do...so the tathāgatas appeared to him and schooled him in the five abhisambodhis...then he attained full buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 3:53 AM

Title: Re: Ngakpa tradition & magic

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hindu Ngakpas:

tomamundsen said:

Are they brahmins or tantrikas?

Malcolm wrote:

Brahmins. But all tantric rites are based ultimately on vedic principles so...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: Ngakpa tradition & magic

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hindu Ngakpas:

Interesting, I know one Tibetan Lama who rocks the dhoti for his white lower robe:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: Ngakpa tradition & magic

Content:

dzoki said:

No ngagpa is not just that, plus there are quite a few ngagpas who cut their hair. And there are several other ways how to become ngagpa apart from Throma empowerment. Ngagpa is a non-celibate vajrayana practitioner in general, but ngagpa is also a sort of institution in India, Nepal and Tibet (in Bhutan they have similar tradition, members of which are called gomchen). Ngagpa is a guy to whom people go for astrological prognostication and divination, for protection rituals and amulets, for burial and funeral rituals and also for advice on spiritual and temporal matters. Ngagpa is a bit similar to a village shaman in other cultures. So real ngagpa needs to know how to do all of those things, otherwise he is just ngagchung, a small ngagpa, a ngagpa in training. Yet ngagpa is again not only that, he is also a yogi, who spends time with his own practice, often doing shorter and longer retreats. Unlike shaman, all of the activities of ngagpa should be motivated by bodhicitta.

Malcolm wrote:

A "real" Ngakpa (i.e. someone who can engage in the ten activities of a ritual master, etc.) is essentially the Tibetan equivalent of a brahmin. In this respect, they could even be a monk.

dzoki said:

Mostly yes, but from what I have heard monks are not allowed to partake in certain activities and rituals of somewhat violent nature. Don't really know what the deal really is here.

Malcolm wrote:

I think that depends on school. Sakyapa monks do everything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Ngakpa tradition & magic

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Why does everyone keep saying ngakpa is a tradition, lineage, etc.?

A ngakpa is just someone who has received a hair empowerment during Throma Nagmo transmission, and thus has the obligation of not cutting their hair.

dzoki said:

No ngagpa is not just that, plus there are quite a few ngagpas who cut their hair. And there are several other ways how to become ngagpa apart from Throma empowerment. Ngagpa is a non-celibate vajrayana practitioner in general, but ngagpa is also a sort of institution in India, Nepal and Tibet (in Bhutan they have similar tradition, members of which are called gomchen). Ngagpa is a guy to whom people go for astrological prognostication and divination, for protection rituals and amulets, for burial and funeral rituals and also for advice on spiritual and temporal matters. Ngagpa is a bit similar to a village shaman in other cultures. So real ngagpa needs to know how to do all of those things, otherwise he is just ngagchung, a small ngagpa, a ngagpa in training. Yet ngagpa is again not only that, he is also a yogi, who spends time with his own practice, often doing shorter and longer retreats. Unlike shaman, all of the activities of ngagpa should be motivated by bodhicitta.

Malcolm wrote:

A "real" Ngakpa (i.e. someone who can engage in the ten activities of a ritual master, etc.) is essentially the Tibetan equivalent of a brahmin. In this respect, they could even be a monk.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's argument for his "interpretive free" translation style

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahahahaahahahaha, the Buddha was a buddha, and people were still confused as shit by his teachings, and he taught them directly in their own language.

BuddhaFollower said:

Buddha taught an internalized version of Sruta.

So you would have to know about Sruta, whether back then or today, to understand what Buddha was teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

Uhuh, so your present theory is that only brahmins can understand Buddhadharma?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's argument for his "interpretive free" translation style

Content:

weenid said:

Scriptural evidence and teacher's authority showing a realized translator:

Malcolm wrote:

My friend, I was referring to the present day, not the eighth century in Tibet. Of course we all accept that Bagor Vairocana was a realized person. But you do understand that in the end, all such authority depends on your acceptance of it as such, correct?

And of course, citations are not enough. You also need reasoning.

Crazywisdom said:

I think you'll agree that when the teaching is coming from a text revealed by the girl the blessings are intense.

Also I would think that you have at least some degree of realization of these texts just based on my experience of you.

Malcolm wrote:

All I can say for myself is that I have been incredibly fortunate to receive the blessings of many fantastic masters. To them I owe any qualities I may have developed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

AlexMcLeod said:

I think you're forgetting one very famous example of a person who became enlightened without hearing a Buddha teach. He became a teacher as well. I'll let you think it through.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really into guessing games. If you've someone in mind, please be forthcoming.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so anyone who awakens to reality is a "Buddha", even if she is from a different tradition (Christianity, Vedanta) or no tradition (philosophy, science)?

Malcolm wrote:

That really depends on what they awaken to, now doesn't it?

gad rgyangs said:

as you said:

the reality of things is always there, awakening to it is always possible whether or not there is a buddha in the world

either you awaken to this "reality of things" or you don't. But the implication of what you are saying is that anyone can awaken to it even if they have never heard of Buddhas or Buddhism. So, they could be a Christian, a Vedantin, a secular philosopher, a poet, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, hence the category of āryas called "pratyekabuddhas." But since they do not teach, how would one know who they are?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

awakening to it is always possible whether or not there is a buddha in the world, re: MMK. That reality is the Dharma, Buddhas realize it.

gad rgyangs said:

so anyone who awakens to reality is a "Buddha", even if she is from a different tradition (Christianity, Vedanta) or no tradition (philosophy, science)?

Malcolm wrote:

That really depends on what they awaken to, now doesn't it?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

and of what use is this baroque mythology?

Malcolm wrote:

If it is not useful to you, I suggest you set it aside without judgement.

gad rgyangs said:

ok so we're back where we started: I was saying that the standard Buddhist teaching is that we are "trapped" in unending Samsara until we become awake/enlightened by following the dharma. you were saying that there is no need for Buddhadharma, we will

inevitably "let go" of attachment to self without it.

Malcolm wrote:

Um, no, I did not say anything of the sort. What I said was that your recommendation to "choose to let go" was fraught with the same problem of reification you were criticizing.

I further pointed out that since the reality of things is always there, awakening to it is always possible whether or not there is a buddha in the world, re: MMK. That reality is the Dharma, Buddhas realize it. If you want to get into yet another long and boorish series of exchanges about "what reality", "who realizes" and so on, replete with fear and apprehension about the possibility of the specter of reification, not interested.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Kaccāni said:

Opinions, umm, yes, conscious experience appears to contain all I've ever encountered.

SpinyNorman said:

Don't worry, us Brits are not the least bit interested in the [INFLAMMATORY AND REDUNDANT ADJECTIVE DELETED] ramblings of some [NOT VERY NICE NAME-CALLING DELETED].

Malcolm wrote:

Did you just call me a [NOT VERY NICE NAME-CALLING DELETED]? Because if so, that is incredibly ill-mannered, especially considering that I don't [DELETED TO KEEP THINGS CONSISTENT]. And as far as [DELETED TO KEEP THINGS CONSISTENT] goes, well:

MODS TO THE RESCUE. Let's keep the dialogue at least at 5th grade level. THANKS!

QQ

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 24th, 2016 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's argument for his "interpretive free" translation style

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Not if the translator is realized.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahahahaahahaha, the Buddha was a buddha, and people were still confused as shit by his teachings, and he taught them directly in their own language.

A realized translator is a desiderata, but go ahead and show me one, and then tell me how it is that you know they are realized. And further, if the translator is realized, what is the point of his or her making translations when they can just teach directly from their experience?

weenid said:

Scriptural evidence and teacher's authority showing a realized translator:

Malcolm wrote:

My friend, I was referring to the present day, not the eighth century in Tibet. Of course we all accept that Bagor Vairocana was a realized person. But you do understand that in the end, all such authority depends on your acceptance of it as such, correct?

And of course, citations are not enough. You also need reasoning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

and of what use is this baroque mythology?

Malcolm wrote:

If it is not useful to you, I suggest you set it aside without judgement.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

doesn't ChNNR say that he should not be thought of as an independent being but rather our real nature?

Malcolm wrote:

That is one of the five, Nature Samantabhadra. With all due respect to ChNN, he does not teach all that there is to know of Dzogchen teachings, because in fact there is too much to learn, and he is focused on what is practical for people who will never learn Tibetan nor read the vast literature of Dzogchen teachings in his lifetime.

Further, there is an account of the liberation of Samantabhadra and the delusion of sentient beings. This is not inconsistent with ChNN's observation you bring up. All phenomena should be understood as the nature of the five Samantabhadras. If it is asked what they are, it is as follows: Original Nature Samantabhadra, Ornament Samantabhadra, Teacher Samantabhadra, Vidyā Samantabhadra and Realization Samantabhadra.

-- Mind Mirror of Samantabhadra Tantra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You may not believe in future telling, but your posts are chock full of value statements.

Kaccāni said:

Of course they are. Otherwise I'd only have come here to either ask questions or gargle. I don't believe in future telling or value statements.

Malcolm wrote:

You make them, but you don't believe in them?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

correct me if im wrong, but im pretty sure orthodox buddhism teaches that unless you go for refuge etc you will trapped forever in the endless cycles of samsara.

Malcolm wrote:

No, obviously this is not correct. If it were so, how would have Samantabhadra attained liberation? In whom would he have taken refuge.

What Nāgārjuna notes in the MMK, to paraphrase, is that even if there were no buddhas at present, awakening is always possible because the reality of things is always present.

gad rgyangs said:

who is Samantabhadra?

Malcolm wrote:

That very much depends on which one of the five Samantabhadra's one is discussing. But in general here we are discussing the adibuddha who attained liberation without

engaging in an iota of virtue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Unknown said:

The so-called Brexit vote is the culmination of years of growing disillusionment—mostly from older and working class Britons—with the European Union’s trade agreements and open border policies. It is also part of a larger trend. Across Europe, populist parties have been fighting to regain sovereignty from the EU. The problems of each country, and of the European Union itself, are contemporary, specific, and complicated. But they fit into a model that some scientists have recognized as symptomatic of a civilization on its way towards disintegration.

Malcolm wrote:

And:

But Turchin thinks a wide view of world history will show that lack of cooperation between rulers and ruled helped bring about the end of the Russian Tsars, the French Monarchy, the British Empire, and many others.

And:

Turchin says Brexit is just a symptom of Europe’s larger issues. These start in Brussels—the site of the EU’s central government. “One of the biggest problems is even though the EU seems democratic, the government is not democratically elected by the people of Europe, and therefore not directly responsive to the population,” says Turchin. Take, for instance, the heavy-handed austerity measures it imposed during the 2010 European debt crisis. Those resulted in widespread unemployment, which is still a problem. And now the EU is dealing with the migrant and immigration crises.

http://www.wired.com/2016/06/science-civilizations-brexit-european-unions-reckoning/?mbid=social_fb

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think you really get it. The EU is a mistake. It is going to splinter anyway.

Kaccāni said:

I get that this is your opinion. It really only needed the first post.

There are many. I don't believe in future telling or value statements.

Best wishes

Kc

Malcolm wrote:

You may not believe in future telling, but your posts are chock full of value statements.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: How to believe in rebirth

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Let's not put the cart before the horse, shall we?

Kaccāni said:

Whether you want to ride the horse or sit in the cabin, your call

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that the only way to transcend the Buddha's teaching is to become a buddha oneself. This does not happen merely by wishing it to be so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Kaccāni said:

The "British" are not so united.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think you really get it. The EU is a mistake. It is going to splinter anyway.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: How to believe in rebirth

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Those who are truly interested in Buddhadharma will make some effort to reconcile themselves to Buddha's teaching of rebirth.

Kaccāni said:

And at least as much to transcend them.

Malcolm wrote:

Let's not put the cart before the horse, shall we?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

mossy said:

funny thing though, just like the 94 assault weapons ban, the manufacturer of kinder eggs found a way to sidestep the ban by making small changes to the product. by making a small part of the capsule visible through the chocolate, the egg was able to be sold in the united states again. so we do actually still have them around here, they are just a little different from the ones found in other places. same thing happened with AR-15's and other "assault weapons" back during the 94 ban. name change, swap the birdcage or whatever flash hider they were using for a pinned muzzle break, get rid of barrel shrouds, hack off the bayonet lugs, and its was no longer a banned assault weapon. defining what an "assault weapon" or other product you want banned is by cosmetic features, means the ban will alwase be bypassed by manufacturers because cosmetic features can easily be changed.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is to eliminate civilian access to semi-automatic weapons. Some facts for consideration:

Despite national attention to the issue of firearm violence, most Americans are unaware that gun crime is lower today than it was two decades ago.

<http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2013/05/07/gun-homicide-rate-down-49-since-1993-peak-public-unaware/#u-s-firearm-deaths>

Thus the argument that one needs a gun for protection is downright ludicrous. In fact, the number one categories of victims of gun homicides are African Americans at 55%.

"...gun suicides now account for six-in-ten firearms deaths, the highest share since at least 1981."

"Compared with other developed nations, the U.S. has a higher homicide rate and higher rates of gun ownership, but not higher rates for all other crimes."

"The Small Arms Survey in 2007 found not only that U.S. civilians had more total firearms than any other nation (270 million) but also that the rate of ownership (about 90 firearms for every 100 people) was higher than in other countries. "With less than 5 percent of the world's population, the United States is home to 35-50 per cent of the world's civilian-owned guns," according to the survey, which included estimates for 178 countries." (seems a bit obsessive, no?)

"As for gun crime, research has found that the U.S. has a higher gun homicide and overall homicide rate than most developed nations, although the U.S. does not have the world's highest rate for either. The U.S. does not outrank other developed nations for overall crime, but crimes with firearms are more likely to occur in the U.S."

"According to U.N. statistics, the U.S. firearm homicide rate and overall homicide rate are higher than those in Canada and in Western European and Scandinavian nations, but lower than those in many Caribbean and Latin American countries for which data are available."

"However, the report placed the U.S. among the top countries for attacks involving firearms. "Mexico, the USA and Northern Ireland stand out with the highest percentages gun-related attacks (16%, 6% and 6% respectively)." The U.S. had the highest share of sexual assault involving guns."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

DGA said:

point of historical order:

when the Romans finally vacated the British Isles, they left a power vacuum. The Celts had grown accustomed to Roman power keeping order. Who filled that vacuum? Angles and Saxons from what is now Flanders and/or the Netherlands--people who speak what we now know of as Old English, which is a very different tongue indeed from anything Celtic. The Celts were pushed northward and westward into Cornwall, Wales, and Scotland, where Celtic languages such as Welsh and Scots Gaelic are still spoken. (and until the middle of the last century, the Isle of Man too.)

my point is that English-ness is derived from those Angles, and not from the Celts displaced by their ancestors.

Which means that the English are, at the core, descendents of economic migrants from Continental Europe.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, not exactly. The Celts resisted the Romans right up till their departure.

Then the Angles and Saxons moved in as a result of pressure on them from the East, and because, as you say, because the British Isles were left in a power vacuum with the withdrawal of the legions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: How to believe in rebirth

Content:

Jeff H said:

I'm only aware of two alternatives: eternal soul and nothing.

Malcolm wrote:

The third alternative is dependent origination. This is the Buddha's alternative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 8:59 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Right, it is post William the Conqueror thing, as above.

In Antiquity, the Romans found Britain to be a dreadful place filled with awful Celts and Picts, and spent most of their time dealing with guerrilla insurrections during the three and half centuries of the Roman conquest. I think the EU is finding out the same thing.

I guess that is the point of the referendum. The British would like to decide this for themselves since a large number of UK citizens don't self-identify as European. I would also wager that a high percentage of the people who do not want the EU are working class.

dzoki said:

If Romans found Britain to be such a dreadful place, I assure you, they would not have stayed there (as they did, even after the collapse of the empire).

Malcolm wrote:

Like conquerers anywhere, the Romans had a specific commodity they wanted from Britain — tin.

dzoki said:

They certainly found area that is present day Slovakia a dreadful place and apart from one excursion by Marcus Aurelius and his army during Marcomannic wars they never again ventured into this territory.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, all terrible "ale," no wine or olive oil.

dzoki said:

The referendum is not on the question whether UK is part of Europe, but whether it is a part of EU, which is a different thing.

Malcolm wrote:

In the minds of the people who oppose it, there is no difference.

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: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Kaccāni said:

If the far right gets too strong, we're going to get another wave of killings. If capitalism continues to concentrate, we're going to get another wave of killings.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, therefore the best thing to do is to prevent power aggregation and keep governments and economies small and local.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 8:36 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

dzoki said:

Oh no, British have been more part of Europe, than they want to admit. Their ancestors came from the continent, their ruling family is from Germany (and the previous ones were from Netherlands, France and Denmark), they vacation in Spain and drink French wines. English language has 30 percent of shared vocabulary with French.

Malcolm wrote:

By this reasoning, the USA is part of Europe.

dzoki said:

USA is on different continent, which UK is not. Also UK has always meddled in continental Europe (and vice-versa), including intermarrying of its nobility to European noble houses, trade, war and cultural exchange and it is not a recent thing.

There is a period we call antiquity and the middle ages in which many things that are shared across the continent including British isles took shape.

Culturally and geographically Britain clearly belongs to Europe. If you look into the country you see castles and Gothic churches just like anywhere else in Europe. You don't see these in America or anywhere else for that matter.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, it is post William the Conqueror thing, as above.

In Antiquity, the Romans found Britain to be a dreadful place filled with awful Celts and Picts, and spent most of their time dealing with guerrilla insurrections during the three and half centuries of the Roman conquest. I think the EU is finding out the same thing.

I guess that is the point of the referendum. The British would like to decide this for themselves since a large number of UK citizens don't self-identify as European. I would also wager that a high percentage of the people who do not want the EU are working class.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 8:21 PM

Title: Re: How to believe in rebirth

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Rebirth is not a soul thing. [Cue: great rebirth thread]

Kaccāni said:

That makes the second problem to explain, then, we weren't there yet.

Malcolm wrote:

Those who are truly interested in Buddhadharma will make some effort to reconcile themselves to Buddha's teaching of rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 8:13 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

dzoki said:

English language has 30 percent of shared vocabulary with French.

Malcolm wrote:

A result of the Norman hegemony (who themselves were Norseman), which suppressed Angol-Saxon culture, language and institutions.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 8:11 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

dzoki said:

Oh no, British have been more part of Europe, than they want to admit.

SpinyNorman said:

Definitely. It's also worth remembering that Britain is made up of four nations, each with their own identity and connections to Europe.

Malcolm wrote:

The Scots and Irish are only tangentially connected with Europe. Sure, we sojourned in Portugal for a while, but we came from Scythia, not Gaul, like the Welsh.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 8:09 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Britain is not part of Europe. Never has been.

dzoki said:

Oh no, British have been more part of Europe, than they want to admit. Their ancestors came from the continent, their ruling family is from Germany (and the previous ones were from Netherlands, France and Denmark), they vacation in Spain and drink French vines. English language has 30 percent of shared vocabulary with French.

Malcolm wrote:

By this reasoning, the USA is part of Europe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 7:53 PM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

So even without Buddhadharma we will let go of grasping self?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, you recall what Nāgārjuna states in the MMK.

gad rgyangs said:

correct me if im wrong, but im pretty sure orthodox buddhism teaches that unless you go for refuge etc you will trapped forever in the endless cycles of samsara.

Malcolm wrote:

No, obviously this is not correct. If it were so, how would have Samantabhadra attained

liberation? In whom would he have taken refuge.

What Nāgārjuna notes in the MMK, to paraphrase, is that even if there were no buddhas at present, awakening is always possible because the reality of things is always present.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 10:01 AM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's argument for his "interpretive free" translation style

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Can you think of any contemporary teacher who had 200 students commit suicide based on a misunderstanding?

Hahahahahaahahahaha, the Buddha was a buddha, and people were still confused as shit by his teachings, and he taught them directly in their own language.

dzogchungpa said:

I would be surprised if the percentage of confused as shit people among the Buddha's disciples was not substantially lower than the corresponding figure for many contemporary teachers.

Malcolm wrote:

.. if the translator is realized, what is the point of his or her making translations when they can just teach directly from their experience?

dzogchungpa said:

This is a good question. Weren't many of the Tibetan translators, like Marpa or Vairotsana, realized?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 7:20 AM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if, as you said above. there is no choice, then whether we act on our afflictions or not is also not the result of choice. Congratulations, you are a Buddhist Calvinist!

Malcolm wrote:

No, you misquote me. I said we have no choice in letting things go. We cannot hold onto anything, even if we want to. This is the nature of impermanence. It is not something we even need to make a choice about.

gad rgyangs said:

So even without Buddhadharma we will let go of grasping self?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, you recall what Nāgārjuna states in the MMK.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 7:17 AM

Title: Re: How to believe in rebirth

Content:

Boomerang said:

If somebody wants to believe in rebirth but has trouble getting to that point, what should they do? What should they read?

Kaccāni said:

Nothing. They're free. Why seduce them into the soul thang, when they don't know the problem at all?

Best wishes

Kc

Malcolm wrote:

Rebirth is not a soul thing. [Cue: great rebirth thread]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 7:13 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Kaccāni said:

That global capitalism problem is bigger, and U.S. foreign policies are not quite innocent in creating it. And Brexit wont stop it.

Malcolm wrote:

And the neoliberal policies that presently drive the EU is going to fix global capitalism how?, given that neo-liberalism is the driving force of global capitalism.

Kaccāni said:

Theose neoliberal policies are not the European people.

Malcolm wrote:

I have been to the continent of Europe many times. In all that time, I have never met a European. I have met French people, Italians, Poles, Germans, etc., but I never met anyone who introduced themselves to me as "European" in the same way Americans introduce themselves as Americans rather than say Californians, Floridians, Michiganders, etc.

Kaccāni said:

Only media power and manipulation are driving people into it. You must understand, that it was more or less a miracle that Merkel rose to power. At the time, Germany had a larger Democrat base than there were Conservatives (which, as an adept of former Chancellor Kohl), she comes from. There were two driving forces that led to her rise. One, the social democrats were split by Oscar Lafontaine (with a little help of former East German politician Gregor Gysi). They formed the "socialist left". This, in fact, rendered a democrat majority both as losers to the Conservative fraction in the election. To this date I wonder what they were paid for doing that. Two, the former liberal party, as a junior partner of the conservatives, considerably turned libertarian in the post-Schröderian heir that Merkel inherited and dwells her reign upon. Unfortunately, their key figure, who could stand for liberal values, Guido Westerwelle, died from Leukemia (after failing to lead the party out of that coalition mess).

Merkel herself is good at maintaining power. She knows how to immobilize political opponents, her main skill. Believe me, the majority of Germans (except maybe Bavaria) are not fond of her reign. Her party has lost considerable voters, to the point that there is a right shift to deal with the new right, trying to regain their base. It's that right shift that is the problem here. Liberal attempts at solving that problem have been too easily dealt with. It's exactly this new right that burns down refugee camps here, that is following the Trumpian example of racial and national separationism. Germany, too, is a melting pot.

Malcolm wrote:

I like what Rudolf Bharo said:

"At last I have understood that a party is a counterproductive tool, that the given political space is a trap into which life energy disappears, indeed, where it is rededicated to the spiral of death."

Kaccāni said:

On top of that, consider that the main source of the new far right originates in the German east (those who were told in this thread to have been screwed over). One problem is, that some rural societies did not have the 50 years of integration attempts with foreign (Turkish, Croatian, Serbian and Italian) workers that the western parts of Germany had. They were freed from a tyrant at exactly the point where capitalist oligarchies went nuts due to the acceleration of markets by automated trading and globalization. That's bad, but it happened. It's susceptible to prejudice. It has turned formerly socialist-oppressed people into capitalism-oppressed racist-nationalists. Now pouring more prejudice there won't help one single bit, but confirm the (we had it in another thread) silly people who get off on "me first!".

Malcolm wrote:

If you think the solution to prejudice is enforcing the technocratic rule of Brussels, you are kidding yourself. The EU survives solely because it is in Germany's present interest that it survive. When that changes, and it will, the EU will collapse like the house of cards that it is.

Kaccāni said:

Uniting all the integration-opponents throughout Europe by example (who thrive on violence against any minority, or say, "foreigners"), is not the way to go. Heck, Suisse claimed that they have more "foreigners" than any E.U. country, and a German nationalist politician publicly asked whether they count Germans as "foreigners". That's the level of public demagoguery there. Those movements exist throughout Europe. Austrian government recently almost turned nationalist-conservative. Let's not talk about Hungary, the chief source of neo-nazism. Or Polish government, who are eager to follow their example. Or those non-central countries like Spain or Greece whose economy suffered a ton. And in the middle of all of that, due to the mess global oil-wars have created in the middle east and the refugee crisis that followed it, Turkish quasi-dictator Erdogan can spill his religio-conservative spit over the whole debate.

Malcolm wrote:

These are symptoms, not the cause. Racism and prejudice are never causes, they are only symptoms of wider dysfunction, and instead of seeing this, you want to double down on a dysfunctional state of affairs.

Kaccāni said:

So now you tell me if you really want more separationism in Europe or not.

Malcolm wrote:

Britain is not part of Europe. Never has been.

Kaccāni said:

It's the best way, in the end, to unite the nationalist-authoritarian forces and to dispell al the rest. That's what Weimar had, and a 5% requirement won't save us.

Malcolm wrote:

If you really want a European Union, you need to more than just a currency union. You will need an actual democratic government, not a system of trade agreements and enforcers of the same.

Each of the nations which form the EU will need to relinquish its own sovereignty.

Since no European nation is willing to do so, least of all the French, your EU was doomed before it began (and of course, it is not an accident that the former Holy Roman Empire regions get along swimmingly, for the most part). You will also need to decide on one official language in which to conduct all business and which will form the primary language of education.

What you are talking about is not an EU, but a United States of Europe, a USE. But you are very far away from a USE because of the individual desire of each of your member nations to preserve its own unique identity. Thus, there is no chance that Europe will ever be able form into a coherent state.

This is why I think that exit is the best way forward for Britain. It may not happen in this referendum, but it will happen eventually, within the next ten years, I guess.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 6:13 AM

Title: Re: How to believe in rebirth

Content:

smcj said:

I advocate simply having enough of an open mind to say to oneself "well, maybe..." Then take it as a hypothetical and look at it intellectually to see if there are internal inconsistencies. Then, without having dismissed it and with an open mind, do your sadhana. One of the signs of progress in sadhana practice is a better understanding and more confidence of karma and rebirth.

Insisting on coming to a firm conclusion about it before you start means you never start imo.

Malcolm wrote:

Personally, I found that having doubt about rebirth was interfering with my practice, so I just accepted it, and I still do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's argument for his "interpretive free" translation style

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Then there will be less confusion.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahaha, no, there will always be just as much confusion.

Crazywisdom said:

Not if the translator is realized.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahahahaahahaha, the Buddha was a buddha, and people were still confused as shit by his teachings, and he taught them directly in their own language.

A realized translator is a desiderata, but go ahead and show me one, and then tell me how it is that you know they are realized. And further, if the translator is realized, what is the point of his or her making translations when they can just teach directly from their experience?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 5:56 AM

Title: Re: How to believe in rebirth

Content:

Boomerang said:

If somebody wants to believe in rebirth but has trouble getting to that point, what should they do? What should they read?

Malcolm wrote:

One will not come to a firm conviction in rebirth through arguments. But if they analyze their mind, and investigate its origin, they will not be able to reject rebirth. Experiential approaches are better than logic.

Boomerang said:

How do you do that?

Malcolm wrote:

You have to ask yourself where your mind comes from. If you think it is a product of the brain, well, there is no way to really convince someone that this is not true. But if they practice meditation, they will eventually loosen their grip on such ideas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: How to believe in rebirth

Content:

Boomerang said:

If somebody wants to believe in rebirth but has trouble getting to that point, what should they do? What should they read?

Malcolm wrote:

One will not come to a firm conviction in rebirth through arguments. But if they analyze their mind, and investigate its origin, they will not be able to reject rebirth. Experiential approaches are better than logic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 5:42 AM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:

So then if there is no choice and no being to practice, why the Buddhadharma?
Please help me see how this conversation is not plunging into emptiness sickness.

Malcolm wrote:

Do we still act on our afflictions? If so, then there continues to be a reason for Buddhadharma.

gad rgyangs said:

if, as you said above. there is no choice, then whether we act on our afflictions or not is also not the result of choice. Congratulations, you are a Buddhist Calvinist!

Malcolm wrote:

No, you misquote me. I said we have no choice in letting things go. We cannot hold onto anything, even if we want to. This is the nature of impermanence. It is not something we even need to make a choice about.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's argument for his "interpretive free" translation style

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

I'm about to say something unpopular. Unless, a text is produced by a lama who transmits it, it is useful only for occasional cross reference.

Malcolm wrote:

There wont be many translations then.

Crazywisdom said:

Then there will be less confusion.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahaha, no, there will always be just as much confusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Kaccāni said:

That global capitalism problem is bigger, and U.S. foreign policies are not quite innocent in creating it. And Brexit wont stop it.

Malcolm wrote:

And the neoliberal policies that presently drive the EU is going to fix global capitalism how?, given that neo-liberalism is the driving force of global capitalism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 5:14 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

dzoki said:

I think in short term it is better for UK to stay. If UK leaves it will mess up not only UK's economy, but also of other EU countries (especially economy of Poland, kurwa!).

Germany will definitely seek revenge by imposing economical restrictions on UK and so will other EU members.

Malcolm wrote:

Ironic, what? Germany, crushed during WWII, the perpetrator of one of the worst wars in world history, now controls what they failed to conquer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

maybay said:

What's all this about de-legitimizing others' opinions...

Malcolm wrote:

Unfortunately, the anti-gun control people seem immune to an evidence-based, epidemiological approach to guns and gun violence, which is why the CDC is restricted to spending only 100K a year on the issue, out of a \$5.5 billion budget, by an act of Congress.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a good reason for staying in. It is like saying, I am in a bad marriage, but if I leave, I might get pimped out, so I would rather stay and be subject to the same beatings as before.

treehuggingoctopus said:

The analogy does not hold. The EU is many things. One of the brilliant things it does is provide us with a transnational platform -- which can never serve neoliberalism and only neoliberalism.

Malcolm wrote:

You see, this is where we disagree. The EU is based on precisely on the kind of damaging free trade agreements that is neoliberalism's hallmark.

treehuggingoctopus said:

And that platform did succeed in preventing nationalism, for as long as we had the

social welfare state. It is only now that it is finally gone that the hard right has re-emerged from its caves.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, what I think has happened is that neoliberal program for the Middle East has utterly failed, placing economic and social pressures on the EU it was never equipped to handle, precisely because it is only a currency union and not a nation.

treehuggingoctopus said:

Oh do give us some time.

Malcolm wrote:

Waiting with baited breath.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Yes, the EU is a bloody mess right now. But exiting destroys the only common platform we have, and if we do so, demons will start to properly wake up again.

Malcolm wrote:

They are waking up anyway.

treehuggingoctopus said:

The crux of the matter is,

(1) Brexit will in all likelihood initiate the collapse of the EU, which is why it is supported by the far right more than anyone else. Neoliberal thugs would not really mind it either -- the grip of their ideology is so firm that neither Brexit nor the collapse of the EU pose any real threat to it. What Hungary, Poland and Ukraine have shown is that you still can have stable marriages of semi-fascist states and firmly neoliberal economies. And

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a good reason for staying in. It is like saying, I am in a bad marriage, but if I leave, I might get pimped out, so I would rather stay and be subject to the same beatings as before.

treehuggingoctopus said:

(2) whether the hard right realises it or not, at the end of the road they want to take there is nothing but carnage. Yugoslavia shows neatly what happens in Europe when common platforms fall apart and nationalism is allowed a place in the public debate. Finally,

Malcolm wrote:

Nationalism is already central. The EU is a failed attempt at controlling the European

Nationalisms that led to WWII.

treehuggingoctopus said:

(3) there is no significant genuine leftwing project in Europe capable of making use of Brexit right now.

Malcolm wrote:

There never will be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 1:02 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

Virgo said:

Oh I haven't forgotten the guns that were pulled on me growing up back in NYC. I'll give you an exaple: the first one was when I was about 15, there was a confrontation and he just lifted his shirt and showed what was in his waistband, a 9.

I'll give you another example: I lived in Lefrak City for a few months when I was a teenager. Shots rang out every night for 6 days in a row. This was just outside my building.

Best,

Kevin

Rakz said:

And both of the places you mentioned are in a state that have some very strict gun control laws which brings back to the point that these laws do nothing but help criminals by disarming law abiding citizens. No thanks jeff.

Malcolm wrote:

I live in Massachusetts.

Rakz said:

It comes as no surprise to gun control advocates that Massachusetts, a state with gun laws among the strongest in the nation and low gun ownership levels, is ranked as the state with the fewest gun deaths per capita by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

Malcolm wrote:

<http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2015/1/30/why-massachusetts-has-the-least-guns-deaths.html>

Rakz said:

In fact, none of the states with the most gun violence require permits to purchase rifles, shotguns, or handguns. Gun owners are also not required to register their weapons in any of these states. Meanwhile, many of the states with the least gun violence require a permit or other form of identification to buy a gun.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://247wallst.com/special-report/2015/06/10/10-states-with-the-most-gun-violence/>

Get a clue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Kaccāni said:

Trump will fix it, then

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, lord no. Trump can't fix anything. He is a total loser.

One of the principle reasons I appose large currency unions is that they disadvantage poorer regions. This is also true in the US, BTW.

If you control your own currency, you can price local goods into your economy affordably. But when you belong to a currency union, this becomes impossible. Thus, when Italy joined the EU, prices soared in Italy, making everything much more expensive than before.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 23rd, 2016 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Corbyn interviewed:

<https://zcomm.org/znetarticle/why-i-am-voting-for-britain-to-remain-in-european-union-in-historic-brexite-vote/>

Malcolm wrote:

Right, he wants Britain to remain in to lay the ground for a left opposition.

But this is all just a neoliberal mess. Who needs it? Britain should exit, in my opinion. Scotland wants to stay in, of course, because they have no economy apart from tourists, despite a lot of fierce leftist posturing. But they should leave too.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2016 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: Refuge/Bodhisattva vows

Content:

Nyedrag Yeshe said:

How is the best way to restore and renew broken refuge and bodhisattva vows? Is it necessary, for someone who actually broke them retake them again at an actual ceremony with a preceptor. Any thoughts?

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrasattva practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2016 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Dumping Trump at Convention

Content:

smcj said:

It's people like this that make me think Trump can still win:

<https://youtu.be/XuNqNEAlbSA>

At around 4 minutes he says he has lots of gay friends that won't publicly admit they support Trump.

Malcolm wrote:

Being gay does not automatically make one sensible, or even intelligent.

smcj said:

No, but being gay is normally a Democratic demographic.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, being gay does not automatically make one sensible, or even intelligent. What gay person in their right mind is going to support Hillary "Marriage is between a man and a woman" Clinton?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2016 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Dumping Trump at Convention

Content:

smcj said:

It's people like this that make me think Trump can still win:

<https://youtu.be/XuNqNEAlbSA>

At around 4 minutes he says he has lots of gay friends that won't publicly admit they support Trump.

Malcolm wrote:

Being gay does not automatically make one sensible, or even intelligent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2016 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

One point in the Gulag Introduction, that might make Leftists & Progressives of today squirm...(nah not likely).

As Applebaum concludes, "to many people the crimes of Stalin [and one may add, those of Mao, Pol Pot, Castro, Ho Chi Minh etc.] do not inspire the same visceral reaction as do the crimes of Hitler." A large part of the reason for these discrepant attitudes was that "to condemn the Soviet Union too thoroughly would be to condemn a part of what some of the Western left once held dear as well." Or as Tony Judt put it: "To many Western European intellectuals communism was a failed variant of a common progressive heritage."

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no, the purges of Stalin, the cultural revolution of Mao, the killing fields of Cambodia, were all essentially born out of an impulse to cultural suicide which was the legacy of centuries of enduring despotic rulers — communism was the excuse, not the cause. It would have happened anyway, whether under a nominally right or left wing regime.

The war in Vietnam was a proxy war, as was the Cuban crisis, and we should have handled things there very differently.

The reason many find the Nazi regime more horrifying is because it was so clearly based on the irrationality of hatred for others.

But in fact, the structure of totalitarian states, whether right or left, are identical. They all rely on a tripod of the military, a civil police force, and a powerful extra-judicial secret police (KGB, Stazi, Gestapo, etc.) who keep watch on the other two.

They all are or should be equally horrific to everyone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2016 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Dumping Trump at Convention

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Disgusting as The Donald is, so much so that my 'any R over any D' promise was made in ignorance of the depth of his shallowness, I cannot blame him entirely. The overweening ambition of the 15 or 20 other Reps. allowed DT to appear a 'winner'. Scott Walker dropped out early and asked others at the bottom of the pack to do so too. Nope, egos ruled.

Malcolm wrote:

Even more than egos, it was all about money and ratings. This election was handpicked by CNN and MSNBC.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2016 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:

So then if there is no choice and no being to practice, why the Buddhadharma?
Please help me see how this conversation is not plunging into emptiness sickness.

Malcolm wrote:

Do we still act on our afflictions? If so, then there continues to be a reason for Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2016 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

kirtu said:

We can (and IMO should) add the sanctity of all life and the deep interdependence of all beings and actions and probably explicitly invoke the Earth/environment as Mother. People with a more direct perception of these truths will be less likely to harm others even in subtle ways.

Malcolm wrote:

Agreed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2016 at 8:57 PM

Title: Re: Dumping Trump at Convention

Content:

Rakz said:
Trump haters everywhere here.

Malcolm wrote:
No, but the man is an idiotic vulgarian whose is unfit for any kind of public service, including handing out parking tickets or sweeping Central Park.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2016 at 8:55 PM
Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism
Content:

orgyen jigmed said:
- Longchen Rabjam

Malcolm wrote:
Who also derides those who do not accept empirical conventions...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2016 at 8:50 PM
Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting
Content:

Fa Dao said:
Malcolm, it would be greatly appreciated if you have Dharma citations that answer the two points I made about the Buddha and the ship captain and the 10th vow. If my understanding of these things is incorrect, according to the Teachings, I have no problem being corrected...

Malcolm wrote:
In order for a being to qualify for "liberation" according to the 10th vows you mention, they must fulfill all the following ten criteria: they must be harmful to the teachings; despise the Jewels; rob the property of the Sangha; despise Mahāyāna; physically harm the guru; wound vajra brothers and sisters; create obstacles to accomplishment; utterly lack love and compassion; lack samaya vows; and possess an incorrect view of cause and result.

As far as the famed ship's captain story, in order to act in the manner of the ship's captain, one must possess the same level of clairvoyance as the ship's captain in order to know whether the mind of a being is truly harmful or not. One must also possess realization of emptiness so that one's compassion is free from any sort of personal self-interest and coloring.

We are heading into the age of weapons. But it can be prevented if human beings set down their arms and embrace each other.

This man refused to visit the United States because we invented and continue to possess nuclear weapons:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2016 at 10:21 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no weapon that can render anyone immune from harm, and indeed, where there are weapons, violence increases exponentially in direct proportion to the force multiplication value of any given weapon being used.

Fa Dao said:

Malcolm,

in an ideal world I wholeheartedly agree with you...but this is samsara, and I for one have no problem taking on the bad karma of taking somebody out that is going to harm either my Teacher, one of my Vajra siblings, or an innocent person. Life is short and there are evil people who would take your precious human rebirth from you thereby delaying your Awakening for who knows how long. I am reminded of the story of the Buddha and the ship captain as well as the 10th root commitment of a ngakpa:

"10. To have compassion for evil beings especially those who harm the doctrine

This refers to failing to act in a potentially disastrous situation and spilling the heart blood of self-justification whenever it violates one's vows. It is a failure of one who holds the bodhisattva vow not to kill, if it saves other beings from harm. A bodhisattva must act towards the liberation of violently malicious beings even if this entails destroying their physical form. This vow must be considered in the context of the fourth vow not to forsake loving kindness on behalf of sentient beings – even those with negative motivation and harmful intentions. Shakyamuni Buddha told a sea captain that an act of murder he committed was not negative as, having overheard the victim plotting to kill all the others on the boat the captain's motivation was compassionate in wishing to save the lives of his five hundred other voyagers. Pacifism should not detract from one's kindness. If the avoidance of killing is merely cowardice and lack of deep concern for others, then failure to act is a breakage of one's vows."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2016 at 9:53 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

All the accounts I have read of tertons flying to Copper Colored Mountain in lucid dreams involves Meru geography.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, we do not have in dreams the same limitations we have when we are awake.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2016 at 9:18 AM

Title: Re: Dumping Trump at Convention

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Trump's obvious political self-annihilation is the only grim satisfaction I will take away from this election season.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2016 at 8:48 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I could not vehemently disagree with your assessment any more than I already do. It is time for us all to put down our weapons, unconditionally, especially Dharma practitioners.

Fa Dao said:

The bottom line here is that guns don't kill people...other people do. "Gun control" is not the answer...criminals and those intent on doing harm to others can and will still get them...gun control laws only keep firearms out of the hands of law abiding citizens and leaves them defenseless against criminals who do have them...the answer lies in finding and eliminating the reasons why people kill each other in the first place. If guns are taken away anyone with access to the internet can easily create an IED and take out far more people than what a gun will. That being said I for one am not comfortable having the government well armed and guns taken away or legislated away from ordinary law abiding citizens...that's what leads to a police state. Tiannamoun and various central american countries come to mind as case in point. One last example: what do you suppose the outcome would have been in Paris, San Bernardino or Orlando had a few law abiding citizens had legal concealed carry weapons with them? Just a different point of view to consider....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 22nd, 2016 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Unknown said:

The Europist left has made a mistake similar to that of the Communists in the past; they too thought that they were acting in the interests of the people, but the latter, being incapable of understanding, had to be led by an unelected elite.

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.counterpunch.org/2016/06/21/the-european-dead-end/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 11:56 PM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe so, maybe not.

Indrajala said:

Norse:

Anders said:

I don't see how nordic mythology fits the bill. It's based on a world tree, not a mountain.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but it comes from a well reputed site of impeccable credentials...so it must be valid...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is also the Dharma of devas and humans

Losal Samten said:

Do you know if this is enumerated in any Indian Buddhist literature? I only know of the http://www.rigpawiki.org/index.php?title=Sixteen_pure_human_laws. Jacob Dalton says the idea of the vehicle of gods and men was originally a Chinese invention, which was ported to Tibet when the Dharma there was young, and when it was rooted enough it was dropped from official doxography.

Malcolm wrote:

It is mentioned in the Pali Canon, but I forget where.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Full agreement on political solutions being of little use. But social issues are part of the context (or maybe are the context) that point to basic Dharma - 'Always do good, never do evil' (Dhammapada).

Malcolm wrote:

I think in this case the only solution is personal development through the Dharma.

Nicholas Weeks said:

I would not confine the solution to only Buddhist folk, the basic ethics, if practiced without sectarianism, would go a long way to cooling off life in this realm.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't really confine "Dharma" to Buddha's Dharma. There is also the Dharma of devas and humans: love, compassion and so on, the practice of the four immeasurables.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

So understanding better Mara's ways regarding abortion, Communism, transgenderism etc. and all the social issues that are called 'right wing' are part of the wisdom needed, that may, in some very distant era, produce people who, knowing what not to do, will live & radiate ahimsa totally.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think the solution lies along any political spectrum we can presently anticipate.

Nicholas Weeks said:

Full agreement on political solutions being of little use. But social issues are part of the context (or maybe are the context) that point to basic Dharma - 'Always do good, never do evil' (Dhammapada).

Malcolm wrote:

I think in this case the only solution is personal development through the Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 8:28 PM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

So understanding better Mara's ways regarding abortion, Communism, transgenderism etc. and all the social issues that are called 'right wing' are part of the wisdom needed, that may, in some very distant era, produce people who, knowing what not to do, will live & radiate ahimsa totally.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think the solution lies along any political spectrum we can presently anticipate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 8:04 PM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Saying something is nonfalsifiable is not the same thing as saying something cannot be falsified. For example, where is Mt. Meru on planet Earth?

If you claim that Meru is actually some structure out in space somewhere, where is it? Things that have been falsified in Meru Cosmology are such things as a geocentric orbit, a flat world and so on.

weenid said:

Mount Meru can be Mount Sineru, the North Pole which is the axis mundi of Earth.

Malcolm wrote:

It is true that some Hindus, who had a round earth theory, maintained that Sumeru was at the poles. But that is equally problematical.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 9:47 AM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So, since you think your "Buddhism as therapy" is really nonsensical, in your view there is nothing to fix, since nothing is actually wrong.

Kaccāni said:

But if there is nothing wrong, there couldn't be getting off on the wrong foot big-time.

gad rgyangs said:

If you want to reduce your suffering, it is counterproductive to think that there is something wrong with either yourself or the world. Its basically the "all things are

possible if emptiness is possible" idea. Thinking there is something wrong with you and reality is reification of both you and reality, locking you into that idea. When you choose to let go of that, it opens up possibilities that you may find are more to your liking.

Malcolm wrote:

Thinking that one has a choice or that indeed there is a choice in letting go of anything is just as bad, and has exactly the faults you ascribe to "Thinking there is something wrong with you and reality is reification of both you and reality, locking you into that idea."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 9:44 AM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Here is the Introduction to another book of personal stories From the Gulag to the Killing Fields. The notes are missing in this pdf, you will have to get the book. The Intro is titled "Distinctive Features of Repression in Communist States"

<http://www.isi.org/books/content/384intro.pdf>

Malcolm wrote:

Friend Nick (we have after all been conversing for years), let me put it to you plainly.

The greatest threat to humanity today is nuclear conflict. We live in a world where no form of government nor regime can keep us safe from the threat of a nuclear holocaust. And in fact, all indications are that we are falling headlong in that kind of conflict, with very few barriers—whether social, political, economic, or military—which seem to be able to withstand it. Thus far, it is only by the amazing self-discipline on the part of all our respective militaries regardless of political system or ideology that we have not actually blown ourselves into oblivion already. We should in fact be amazed we still exist given how easily we can destroy ourselves if just a few conditions are not met or backfire.

So the real question is: how do we prevent humanity's utter self-destruction? This is really the only salient question we should have in our minds in any discussion of post Hiroshima world politics.

In reality, the only acceptable alternative—since all others merely lead to the endless conflict of war and its miseries—is the complete and utter disarmament of humanity. This is the only sane path forward.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 7:54 AM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Ah, that noble ole road of good intentions that paves the way to...

Simply ridiculous to defend or explain the Reds based on the motive of Lenin or Stalin or Mao or Castro et al. But Malcolm always had a contrary, contentious streak.

Malcolm wrote:

Marx himself termed Capitalism "progressive," a necessary phase in human history. Marx's specific theory was that the Socialist phase in human history could only happen after the world economy had been completely industrialized under advanced Capitalism. Lenin decided this was not necessary, that one only needed proletariat elites, and that this was sufficient for revolution.

Frankly, Marx really had no idea what advanced Capitalism looked like. He further thought, inaccurately, that the revolution was going to happen in the US and Western Europe. Boy, was he ever mistaken about that.

The brutalism you are referring to was a direct result of Lenin's jumping the gun and revising Marx's theory.

Today, there are no more "Reds", other than in name only. Fascist Corporatism is winning largely because of neoliberalism. Nationalized socialisms such as Stalinism, Maoism, etc., were never going to win against international capital.

As far as I am concerned, Totalitarianism, whether right or left, "capitalist" or "socialist," needs to be resisted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 7:20 AM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Myoho-Nameless said:

Kropotkin's anarchist communism and what is normally identified as "communism" colloquially in the US, that is Marxism, are different entities.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed.

Myoho-Nameless said:

HHDL even called himself "half marxist, half Buddhist" I heard.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, something very like that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 7:18 AM

Title: Re: On Buddhism and Nominalism

Content:

Kaccāni said:

If universals would exist they could be defined as "substance" of the experience they're seen in. Reminds of Michel Foucault with his invisible magic grid.

So we come down to the one phenomenon that appears to be constant: change.

Does that make it a "universal"? Meh. "Universal" is a creature of the mind when there "is" only change. And even that change is just an appearance in that what consciousness points at. If it ends, it ends. Universe done or universal done? You decide.

Malcolm wrote:

change is not a dharma, it is a characteristic. subtle point, but important.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 7:15 AM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

As Buddhists we all agree that suffering is pervasive and spending time contrasting sources of group pain, is pointless. Except for the point which I mention now. Every single culture worthy of the name has made a provision for, some have based their culture on, spiritual or religious living. One reason Communism is not a worthy 'culture' is because they crushed all forms of that 'opiate of the people'.

That is their prime vice and why if the Reds are not the Primary Evil, they are, in recent history, one vicious group of demonic folk.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, the reason they suppressed religion is because they decided it was a primary cause of suffering. The Communists were motivated in fact to remove suffering.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hahah, the illustration is much older than that website and the info is accurate.

But here you go:

And:

<http://slideplayer.com/slide/2799874/>

Sure, but Babylonian:

Indrajala said:

<http://ufodigest.com/> is not a valid source.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 4:32 AM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Malcolm, I truly would like to know how you know who 'suffered most'? I did not qualify, nor does the website, what sort of victims suffered. Whether Buddhist or not, matters little. Look at the Cambodian doctor who was removed from treating the children in his care...

Is it body count, physical torture or mental duress over decades... The main point is that every communist govt. was the cause of vast suffering and we should never forget that.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and the American Govt. too also has been the author of great suffering, you know, for example the systematic genocide of American Indians, slavery, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 4:29 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, but Babylonian:

Indrajala said:

...but the geography of Mt. Meru is really originally an Indo-European idea. You find it throughout Indo-European civilizations.

Malcolm wrote:
Maybe so, maybe not.

Indrajala said:
Norse:

Zoroastrian:

Can't find anything scholarly looking so here's this:

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 4:05 AM
Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism
Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As a moral and aesthetic cosmology, not literally. For example, Edward Henning, probably the world's leading expert on Kalacakra calculations right now, points out in his lengthy technical book, Kalacakra and the Tibetan Calendar, that the authors of the Kalacakra certainly did not take the Meru cosmology literally because the calculations it offers for calendar making won't work in a Meru Cosmology, though they do work fine in a terra-centric model, just like Ptolemaic astrology (upon which all Indian astrological systems are based).

Indrajala said:

Are you saying all Indian astrological systems are based on Ptolemy's system? If so, that's not true.

Malcolm wrote:

Pretty much, it is true. The language Indians use to describe these things are largely lifted from Greek. I am not suggesting that Indians did not have their own astrological and astronomical ideas prior to the Greeks, for they certainly did, but in terms of calendar making and so on...

Indrajala said:

The original Kalacakra authors studied a number of astronomical systems available to them, one of which was most certainly based on a Hellenistic model since it uses a tropical zodiac (in contrast to a sidereal zodiac which was the norm in India -- the Kalacakra sages were quite innovative by the standards of their day). The Kalacakra also describes the corruption of siddhānta -s (astronomical treatises), which the commentary identifies as those of Brahma, Sauram, Yamanakam and Romakam. They took into consideration a number of models with clear foreign sources, so they had to

somehow fit the mathematical astronomy they understood (much of Hellenistic in origin) with Meru cosmology.

Malcolm wrote:

But they didn't really fit it in. You should check out Henning's book, if you have it.

Indrajala said:

However, in earlier periods Buddhists unquestioningly believed in flat earth cosmology. The * Lokasthānābhidharma-śāstra 佛說立世阿毘曇論, for instance, details a flat earth cosmology of Mt. Meru and the four continents, explaining in literal physical terms how these two bodies (which are described as flat drum-shaped deva palaces) orbit above the disc-shaped world at an altitude half that of Mt. Meru, driven by a circuit of wind (vāyu-maṇḍalaka). Solar luminosity is said to be a result of karma of beings. In such a world, the flat earth is stationary while the sun, moon and stars revolve above, not actually dipping below the edge of the world. The apparent arc that the sun follows as it rises and sets as seen from earth is the sun following along its circular path above at an unchanging altitude.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it does indeed. But I have doubts that all Buddhists took this literally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Indrajala said:

...but the geography of Mt. Meru is really originally an Indo-European idea. You find it throughout Indo-European civilizations.

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe so, maybe not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

heart said:

Elon Musk is suggesting that there is a very good chance our universe is a computer simulation. Donald Hoffman suggest that whatever we experience with our senses might have very little to do with what reality actually is. An other scientist, his name escapes me, suggest that the universe is a hologram.

I think the Mount Meru Cosmology might still have its day.

Malcolm wrote:

People make a lot of suggestion, but at the end of the day, the sun never has and never will circle the earth (outside of a computer model of course, which would actually show how untenable some naive Buddhists beliefs about this are.)

As I have stated before, and will do so again, Meru Cosmology is, in reality, a mythologized Indo-centric view of the planet, with Jambudvipa being what we today call India.

heart said:

Could be Malcolm, I don't know. But I really don't think Mount Meru been a visible mountain in India at any time in history.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

If you have read the Mahābharata, it describes people going to the slopes of Meru to picnic. It is not like Buddhists had the sole claim to Meru cosmologies in India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

heart said:

Elon Musk is suggesting that there is a very good chance our universe is a computer simulation. Donald Hoffman suggest that whatever we experience with our senses might have very little to do with what reality actually is. An other scientist, his name escapes me, suggest that the universe is a hologram.

I think the Mount Meru Cosmology might still have its day.

Malcolm wrote:

People make a lot of suggestion, but at the end of the day, the sun never has and never will circle the earth (outside of a computer model of course, which would actually show how untenable some naive Buddhists beliefs about this are.)

As I have stated before, and will do so again, Meru Cosmology is, in reality, a mythologized Indo-centric view of the planet, with Jambudvipa being what we today call India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Pay more attention to the victims from the Dharma peoples of SE Asia, China, Cuba --- the Soviets are not the only example.

Malcolm wrote:

In all fairness, it must be pointed out that the people at whose hands Vietnamese Buddhists suffered the worst were the French, not the commies.

In this day and age, however, it is neoliberalism that is producing the most economic and social suffering. It may not be the same as the outright brutality of the Stalinists and Maoists, but the ghettoization of the world proceeds apace in the name of corporate liberalism and the "free market."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

orgyen jigmed said:

Whoever is a Buddhist must believe in Buddhist cosmology.

According to Karl Popper the discrimination criterion that distinguishes a scientific theory from a non-scientific theory is the principle of falsifiability. Strictly speaking Buddhist Cosmology has not been falsified, and thus it cannot be disproved.

Malcolm wrote:

Saying something is nonfalsifiable is not the same thing as saying something cannot be falsified. For example, where is Mt. Meru on planet Earth?

If you claim that Meru is actually some structure out in space somewhere, where is it? Things that have been falsified in Meru Cosmology are such things as a geocentric orbit, a flat world and so on.

When even the HH Dalai Lama has rhetorically requested Vasubandhu to rewrite the third chapter of the Abhidharmakośa, and masters like Chogyal Namkhai Norbu consistently poke fun at Tibetans who insist on adhering to this outmoded traditional belief, I find it amazing that obtuse westerners insist that literal adherence to this cosmology is somehow something of great value.

If you really believe that the only thing preventing us all from being suffocated by the lethal fumes of the border hells is the ring of iron mountains around the four continents and Meru, honestly I feel a little sorry for you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think so.

Whoever is a Buddhist must believe in Buddhist cosmology.

-- Pg. 124, A Cascading Waterfall of Nectar.

Anders said:

ouch.

weenid said:

A corollary of not believing in Buddhist cosmology, specifically Mount Meru, must also mean we should believe in only 2 realms of existence (humans and animals) as opposed to the other 4 realms (hells, hungry ghosts, asuras, gods) which are cosmologically located below and above Mount Meru.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not follow at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 21st, 2016 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I agree except Buddhists do not want to "die completely". They want to "break free from the cycle of rebirths" in order to help other beings with their suffering issues. But yes, most (or all?) religions start with the idea that something is wrong, either with us or with the world, that needs to be fixed. I would call this getting off on the wrong foot big-time.

Malcolm wrote:

So, since you think your "Buddhism as therapy" is really nonsensical, in your view there is nothing to fix, since nothing is actually wrong.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2016 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Victims of Communism

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

That's a much more reasonable statement than Nicholas' implicit declaration that all communist regimes were (and are) always oppressive.

But the Soviet Union was (and is) Communist in name only.

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

Communism describes the end goal of Marxist Socialism, communists are those who believe in that goal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 20th, 2016 at 9:31 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I think we really need to lift the unconstitutional ban on lawn darts...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2016 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Disillusioned by gradual teachings

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Among many other things, the function of a sadhana is to work with the experiential wisdom, after it has been stabilized by working with the experiential view. This is how the student "brings back" that recognition, in terms of sadhana practice.

Trangu Rinpoche's statement is consistent with the Sūtra yāna approach upheld in Kagyu and Gelug, but it is not the approach in Sakya and Nyingma.

It means that one has received direct introduction through the word empowerment and is experientially familiar with the example wisdom. So no, one has not realized emptiness, but neither is one pretending.

Dzogchen, of course, is quite different.

Astus said:

Example wisdom occurs at the wisdom empowerment, but according to Tsele Natsok (Empowerment, p 41) if it's not genuine insight "there is no way to recognize all forms of conceptual thinking to be the innate nature (dharmata), and thus one misses the point of the third empowerment. Without experiencing the nature of the third empowerment, one does not obtain the true fourth empowerment."

Also, according to Thrangu rinpoche (Creation and Completion, p 142-143), the sudden pointing out of the nature of the mind "as authentic as it is, is in some ways adulterated by conceptualization and therefore remains an experience rather than a realization. The problem with this is that, while the recognition is authentic as far as it goes, because it is incomplete and imperfect, it will at some point vanish. When it vanishes, the student

does not know how to bring it back, because their initial recognition was experienced under the dramatic circumstances of receiving the pointing out from their guru." That is practically a criticism of the example wisdom. Therefore, he says, the solution to that in the Kagyu tradition is "to enable students, through their own exploration, to come to a decisive recognition of the mind's nature."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2016 at 8:55 PM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

SpinyNorman said:

Eh? Whose collective karma?

Malcolm wrote:

He means the karma-vipaka of all the people who were injured and slain. Of course, the shooter created his own karma.

SpinyNorman said:

Oh. I was querying the notion of "collective" karma here, which could lead to blaming the victims.

Malcolm wrote:

When people engage in an action together, this is called collective karma, and if the karma is strong enough, the ripening can occur en masse.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2016 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: Chinese demolition order - Larung Gar

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Funny how fanatics like you paint everything in two shades.

Jayarava said:

All these hurtful personal comments, Malcolm. Isn't making ad hominem attacks against the rules?.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2016 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: Britain's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That is because it is not a whole. The French are French, the Dutch are Dutch, Spaniards

are Spaniards., etc. Corporations benefit immensely from the EU arrangement— people, well, not so much.

Sherab Dorje said:

I agree, but it doesn't have to be like this. It was set up, from the beginning, with a neo-liberal agenda, not a socialist one.

Well, actually, not exactly. It is socialist on lots of levels, maybe not so much economically, that is for sure. Although there is a large degree of state planning in that sector too.

It is a type of capitalist federalism with a semi-planned economy.

Malcolm wrote:

England should leave. They will be better off for it, no matter what the neoliberal economists claim.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2016 at 4:43 AM

Title: Re: Chinese demolition order - Larung Gar

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So typical of you...judgmental, patronizing, colonialist, etc.

Jayarava said:

Let your hate flow Malcolm. The Dark Side is strong in you.

Malcolm wrote:

Funny how fanatics like you paint everything in two shades.

Jayarava said:

The place is run by a woman. The sangha there is the largest in the world and runs by consensus.

It cannot be run "by a woman" and "by consensus" - that is a logical contradiction. When the founder was alive he either made or approved all decisions. It sounds like his successors took over the reigns.

Malcolm wrote:

You really do need to learn how to read. But I will parse the two sentences for you, so as to make it more manageable for you:

1) The place is run by his niece.

2) The Sangha there, like all Sanghas, is run by consensus.

Jayarava said:

The real reason the place is under constant attack is that it attracts thousands of Chinese devotees.

In 2001, 2016 the govt required this massive slum to be made smaller - both times leaving the core intact and demolishing hovels. Hardly "constant attack". As I say, if it were happening in the UK we'd have clear this slum by now. And arrested those who resisted. There is precedent.

Malcolm wrote:

You simply have no idea what you are talking about. You have never been there, I hazard you have never even been to Tibet.

Jayarava said:

Perhaps the Chinese might consider using bulldozers to create sanitation rather than bulldozing down people's homes.

They might do. But why is the woman who runs the place, or the consensus, whichever it is, not doing so? They clearly have plenty of money.

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetans have very different ideas about what is important than you do, obviously. But since you react with typical English colonial sentiments, there is no point in discussing it with you further.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2016 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Chinese demolition order - Larung Gar

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So typical of you...judgmental, patronizing, colonialist, etc.

Jayarava said:

...snip...

If the people who run the place were more obviously looking after the people; allowing them a vote, providing equal rights for women; and providing sanitation, running water, and all the things we expect in a civilised country (if it wasn't a medieval slum in other words) then I'd be a lot more sympathetic. As it is, they do seem to need an intervention of some kind. And reducing their numbers to just 5000 seems quite restrained.

Malcolm wrote:

The place is run by a woman. The sangha there is the largest in the world and runs by consensus.

The real reason the place is under constant attack is that it attracts thousands of Chinese devotees.

Perhaps the Chinese might consider using bulldozers to create sanitation rather than bulldozing down people's homes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2016 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

Norwegian said:

And if you want the AR-15 to be fully automatic, you can install a small piece of hardware that makes it an equal to the M-16, except costing the fraction of what an M-16 costs...

Malcolm wrote:

And people in the service only rarely use the full auto setting, and the civilian model only as one setting, semi-auto.

SpinyNorman said:

Most weapons on full auto are difficult to control and therefore very innaccurate.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. As someone pointed out above, it is primarily used for suppressive fire.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2016 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

amanitamusc said:

Really sad what happened to those 50 humans.It was collective karma.

SpinyNorman said:

Eh? Whose collective karma?

Malcolm wrote:

He means the karma-vipaka of all the people who were injured and slain. Of course, the shooter created his own karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2016 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

Norwegian said:

And if you want the AR-15 to be fully automatic, you can install a small piece of hardware that makes it an equal to the M-16, except costing the fraction of what an M-16

costs...

Malcolm wrote:

And people in the service only rarely use the full auto setting, and the civilian model only as one setting, semi-auto.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2016 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.wired.com/2016/06/ar-15-can-human-body/>

Unknown said:

The bullet from an AR-15 does an entirely different kind of violence to the human body. It's relatively small, but it leaves the muzzle at three times the speed of a handgun bullet. It has so much energy that it can disintegrate three inches of leg bone. "It would just turn it to dust," says Donald Jenkins, a trauma surgeon at University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio. If it hits the liver, "the liver looks like a jello mold that's been dropped on the floor." And the exit wound can be a nasty, jagged hole the size of an orange.

These high-velocity bullets can damage flesh inches away from their path, either because they fragment or because they cause something called cavitation. When you trail your fingers through water, the water ripples and curls. When a high-velocity bullet pierces the body, human tissues ripples as well—but much more violently. The bullet from an AR-15 might miss the femoral artery in the leg, but cavitation may burst the artery anyway, causing death by blood loss. A swath of stretched and torn tissue around the wound may die. That's why, says Rhee, a handgun wound might require only one surgery but an AR-15 bullet wound might require three to ten.

Then, multiply the damage from a single bullet by the ease of shooting an AR-15, which doesn't kick. "The gun barely moves. You can sit there boom boom boom and reel off shots as fast as you can move your finger," says Ernest Moore, a trauma surgeon at Denver Health and editor of the Journal of Trauma and Acute Surgery, which just published an issue dedicated to gun violence.

Malcolm wrote:

Any questions?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2016 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Disillusioned by gradual teachings

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is termed "taking the result as the path."

Astus said:

Does that mean one has actually realised emptiness? Or is it just pretending?

Malcolm wrote:

It means that one has received direct introduction through the word empowerment and is experientially familiar with the example wisdom. So no, one has not realized emptiness, but neither is one pretending.

Dzogchen, of course, is quite different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 18th, 2016 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: Disillusioned by gradual teachings

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In a sadhana you start with the realization of emptiness at the beginning.

Astus said:

So anyone who even begins one is a realised being?

Malcolm wrote:

It is termed "taking the result as the path."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: Mechanics of Enlightenment

Content:

Astus said:

Madhyamika analysis in meditation is very much there in TB, for instance in Mahamudra, even if they pretend it's something different.

Malcolm wrote:

While it is true that there is some preliminary analysis derived from Madhyamaka reasonings which may be found in Lamdre, Kagyu Mahāmudra and so on, the key distinction is that Madhyamaka offers no method of directly experiencing one's own dharmatā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Britian's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Theoretically there is a shared culture: European culture.

Malcolm wrote:

Nice theory. But it is just that, a theory.

Sherab Dorje said:

Now you are starting to get the gist of the problem. Although there is an economic union, the states still consider themselves separate economic and political entities and each one jockey for a favorable position within the union, instead of looking at what would benefit the whole.

Malcolm wrote:

That is because it is not a whole. The French are French, the Dutch are Dutch, Spaniards are Spaniards., etc. Corporations benefit immensely from the EU arrangement— people, well, not so much.

Sherab Dorje said:

These are examples of how the currently conceived union is not a sustainable project. If the union was based on the MUTUAL aid and not the individual profit of its member states, then it would work just fine.

Malcolm wrote:

It was set up, from the beginning, with a neo-liberal agenda, not a socialist one.

Sherab Dorje said:

Even Germany is not really a unified entity. Consider how the west Germans screwed the east Germans on the currency exchange. That is an as yet unresolved social/cultural, economic and political issue.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, Germany still benefits from the EU the most.

Sherab Dorje said:

Look at the north/south divide in the US: 150+ years and still bubbling away.

Malcolm wrote:

I have often thought that the US would be better off divided into four or more separate countries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Britain's upcoming E.U referendum

Content:

Losal Samten said:

That does not sound like an intelligent thing to do. Separationists utopias only work in

separation. They don't tell you that. Nations are interwoven into one big network of dependencies. Separateness is an ... illusion. *SCNR*.
A forced, artificial dependency created from the outside. A dependency within which Britain cannot negotiate with other nations on its own terms.

Kaccāni said:

That dependency will not end by leaving the Union. The "old frontiers" don't exist in globalized, highly automated money markets.

It could negotiate with the other nations within the E.U. on its own terms. But as I read your statements, the other E.U. nations are not considered those other nations. With the same argument, you can build a fence around your house and stack up weapons, because you cannot negotiate with the legislators, but are forced to vote.

There's still too much hatred between nations in Europe, instead of "thinking Europe".
Let's hope this will not need another turning, as the in-between usually becomes violent.

Best wishes

Kc

Malcolm wrote:

The EU is a failed experiment that mainly benefits Germany. A currency union without a shared cultural union is bound to fail. The EU countries should all return to their own currencies. It is the best way they can protect their economies. Greece, Spain, Italy, etc. prove that the EU is not a sustainable project.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Disillusioned by gradual teachings

Content:

smcj said:

I believe, as do all my lamas, that you can attain the highest realisations through sadhana practice.

Astus said:

And what is it in a sadhana that is the cause of realisation?

Malcolm wrote:

In a sadhana you start with the realization of emptiness at the beginning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: On Buddhism and Nominalism

Content:

Wayfarer said:

I think this is as near as Buddhism gets to acknowledging universals.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhism accepts universals as abstractions from particulars. The universal "Buddha" comes from having experienced buddhas.

Buddhism in general is a form of pure nominalism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 11:16 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

Unknown said:

But I don't want an assault rifle. I don't want to be back in Afghanistan either. I've shot thousands of rounds, and I've seen the effects of the bullets' impact, and I want nothing of it. A friend of mine, himself an Army Special Forces officer with numerous combat deployments, agonized over the massacre in Orlando: "People who say they need an AR for hunting or home defense often don't understand the weapon's ballistics or overpenetration," he said. "ARs cause horrific damage to humans; that's why the military developed them." He continued: "If you want to shoot an AR so bad, please feel free to join the fight against ISIS in the military."

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/16/magazine/i-used-an-assault-rifle-in-the-army-i-dont-think-civilians-should-own-them.html?smid=nytcore-ipad-share&smprod=nytcore-ipad>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 11:07 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

Virgo said:

Actually I would like to ban almost all guns. If you are a hunter, or need one for work, etc., then you should have to apply for a permit, go through a proper background check, go through proper training to have it, and after a waiting period you should be allowed to possess it with restrictions and be able to show that you store it correctly. Our gun culture is pathetic and asinine.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as well as carry liability and accident insurance for it

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 5:18 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

tomamundsen said:

His view is that both heliocentric and disk-world views are delusion.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think so.

Whoever is a Buddhist must believe in Buddhist cosmology.

-- Pg. 124, A Cascading Waterfall of Nectar.

tomamundsen said:

I was going off of a quote earlier in the thread:

There is no need to be concerned if some people think the world is round and moving, and others think the world is flat and still, since it is all delusion. It is not necessary to explain each detail of phenomena: just to understand that all phenomena, including all material judgements, can be recognized as manifestation, so there is no reality to each single explanation and no need to endlessly analyze conceptions.

That one seems to override beliefs, too.

Malcolm wrote:

Then it is an amazing waste of his time to devote an entire chapter to defending the validity of Buddhist cosmology as being more valid than modern physics since he repeatedly grounds Buddhist cosmology in what he takes to be Buddha's omniscience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The ruling you cite refers to tasers, and not assault rifles.

tomamundsen said:

And yet it did make a statement on the intentions of the Second Amendment.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, SCOTUS expanded the meaning of the Second Amendment to include personal defense from people attempting to commit crimes.

As SCOTUS notes above in the Heller decision:

"the right is not unlimited. It is not a right to keep and carry any weapon whatsoever in any manner whatsoever and for whatever purpose".

Right, and there are already regulations. This is already not the case.

Regulations are state by state. We need broad federal regulations concerning what kinds of guns we allow to be marketed to civilians, for example, no assault rifles, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 5:12 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

tomamundsen said:

His view is that both heliocentric and disk-world views are delusion.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think so.

Whoever is a Buddhist must believe in Buddhist cosmology.

-- Pg. 124, A Cascading Waterfall of Nectar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 4:50 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dante, I don't see you there...

dzogchungpa said:

I think he is the elephant...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

tomamundsen said:

That is not what the recent Supreme Court rulings have shown. There are two clauses in the Second Amendment.

Malcolm wrote:

SCOTUS rulings can be overturned. But here are the precedents:

Long a controversial issue in American political, legal, and social discourse, the Second Amendment has been at the heart of several Supreme Court decisions.

In *United States v. Cruikshank* (1875), the Court ruled that "[t]he right to bear arms is not granted by the Constitution; neither is it in any manner dependent upon that instrument for its existence. The Second Amendment means no more than that it shall not be infringed by Congress, and has no other effect than to restrict the powers of the National Government."^[85]

In *United States v. Miller* (1939), the Court ruled that the amendment "[protects arms that had a] reasonable relationship to the preservation or efficiency of a well regulated

militia".[86]

In *District of Columbia v. Heller* (2008), the Court ruled that the Second Amendment "codified a pre-existing right" and that it "protects an individual right to possess a firearm unconnected with service in a militia, and to use that arm for traditionally lawful purposes, such as self-defense within the home" but also stated that "the right is not unlimited. It is not a right to keep and carry any weapon whatsoever in any manner whatsoever and for whatever purpose".[87]

In *McDonald v. Chicago* (2010),[88] the Court ruled that the Second Amendment limits state and local governments to the same extent that it limits the federal government.[89] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Bill_of_Rights#Second_Amendment

The ruling you cite refers to tasers, and not assault rifles. As SCOTUS notes above in the *Heller* decision:

"the right is not unlimited. It is not a right to keep and carry any weapon whatsoever in any manner whatsoever and for whatever purpose".

It is my point of view that it is not constitutionally problematical at all to limit assault rifles for civilian use under this principle. Use of sporting weapons such as bolt-action or single-action rifles or breech-loaded shotguns for hunting and so on, I have no issue with. Possession of semiautomatic handguns such as Glocks, etc., should be reserved for police and military use, along with semi-automatic rifles and shotguns. You will note that in none of the decisions SCOTUS made is there any mention of the Second Amendment being validly used to defend oneself against the State. You do not have that right, and you never have.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 4:34 AM

Title: Re: Energy aspects

Content:

naljor said:

So their strengthening depends on working with astrology? Because I also notice similar dysfunctions in family and I have idea that astrology is something individual...

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on understanding your yearly reading, and applying the proper antidotes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 4:24 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Sure. Although some drugs could potentially be used maliciously to kill large numbers of people. I'm not really trying to be rigorous and convince people, just stating my opinion.

Malcolm wrote:

Since this is a question of life and death, one should not wave around flaccid opinions. As a Dharma practitioner, you have an obligation to observe the principle of nonharming. The Buddha clearly identified trade in weapons as an incorrect, harmful livelihood.

I don't think you can rationally defend the way guns are deregulated in the US.

tomamundsen said:

I'm not planning on trading weapons myself, this is an issue of the rights of the citizens of our country. The rational defense is to cite the Bill of Rights or the http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/15pdf/14-10078_aplc.pdf.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the Bill of Rights:

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

The present gun policies of the US do not support a well-regulated Militia. They in fact do the opposite. What this statement in fact says is that the government should not infringe orderly, well-regulate Militias. Why? To defend the State. There is no language in this amendment that suggests the second amendment supports the idea of protecting oneself against the Gvt. It suggests the opposite in fact, that citizens use their arms to suppress threats to the State.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 4:19 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

kirtu said:

So in all seriousness, we can approximate some level of fascist support in this country between 40%-71% of American adults using real data.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, the same can be said of Denmark, the Netherlands, etc. But I am sure, according to you, it is all really America's fault.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

orgyen jigmed said:

Blind persons designate various names to the body of a sturdy elephant, but the elephant itself does not become other than what it was

- Longchenpa

gad rgyangs said:

elephant perspectives 6.jpg

Malcolm wrote:

Dante, I don't see you there...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Energy aspects

Content:

naljor said:

I have a question ...are different aspects of our being like lungta, wangtang etc. part of our energy system (channels, prana) or it is something what we inherited from our ancestors or merely the result of our actions...

Malcolm wrote:

These things are related to so-called elemental astrology.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

anjali said:

Just to stir the pot.

<http://townhall.com/tipsheet/mattvespa/2016/06/14/oh-the-orlando-killer-didnt-use-an-ar15-rifle-n2177835>

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, we know that. We should ban all semi-automatic rifles.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Have you ever examined or shot an AR-15?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, as well as 30-06 bolt-action rifles, Remington .222 deer rifles, .22's, assorted shotguns, AK-47's, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 3:37 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Just in case anyone really doubts the AR-15 is a military grade weapon:

The AR-15 is a military and civilian rifle that has been produced in many different versions. The term AR-15 was chosen by Colt for the civilian models it produced after selling the rifle to the U.S. military as the M16 rifle, and many people and references use the term AR-15 exclusively for civilian models. This article discusses the original design for military users and its major variants, however they are labeled. AR-15 rifles are lightweight, gas-operated, magazine-fed, and air-cooled. They fire an intermediate cartridge, and are manufactured with extensive use of aluminum alloys and synthetic materials.

The AR-15 was first built in 1959 by ArmaLite as a small arms rifle for the United States armed forces. Because of financial problems, ArmaLite sold the design to Colt. After some modifications, the redesigned rifle was adopted as the M16 rifle. In 1963, Colt started selling the semi-automatic version of the rifle for civilians designated as the Colt SP1. Although the name AR-15 remains a Colt registered trademark, variants of the firearm are made, modified, and sold under various names by multiple manufacturers.
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AR-15>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

Queequeg said:

yes.

does anyone disagree?

tomamundsen said:

I disagree. I'm not keen on the government taking away citizens' rights and further tipping the scales of power into their hands.

maybay said:

If you can't agree to your government having an exclusive right to violent means its hard to imagine what power you think they should wield. The whole point of limiting violent means is to secure citizens from each other, not from government. Unless you plan on threatening government with violence, which is ridiculous, your position is unjustifiable.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Tom should read up on his Nozick. Many so-called libertarians fail to understand that the minimal state is precisely about ceding control of violence to a Gvt., in return for protection from enemies, foreign and domestic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 3:23 AM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's argument for his "interpretive free" translation style

Content:

Fortyeightvows said:

English speakers need to standardize their translations! Especially of terms, we could look to translators of the past for examples on how to do this, for example the five things you don't translate 五種不翻, etc..

Malcolm wrote:

It is too early to do that. In another 100 years or so, maybe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

Rakz said:

Gun control is not the answer. France has some very strict gun control but that didn't stop the Radical Islamic terrorists now did it?

Malcolm wrote:

This is not actually about terrorists. Don't be myopic. In 2013 11,000 people were murdered with guns, 3.5 per 100,000. But this is not the real number of deaths from firearms. In 2013, 33,169 people died as a direct result of firearms. This number excludes the number of people killed by the police. In 2010, gun violence cost \$516 Million. Congress of course, in their infinite wisdom, has forbidden the CDC from conducting further research and analysis of gun violence since 2013.

Most mass shootings (four or more people in a public place) are committed by white

males (67%).

The US has gun insanity. No one who considers themselves a Dharma person has any business owning a gun or encouraging others to own guns beyond specialized guns used solely for target competitions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

tomamundsen said:

I also don't smoke crack, but I don't think it should be illegal for people to purchase hardcore drugs.

Malcolm wrote:

This is definitely a false equivalence. You can't gun people down with a bag of crack.

tomamundsen said:

Sure. Although some drugs could potentially be used maliciously to kill large numbers of people. I'm not really trying to be rigorous and convince people, just stating my opinion.

Malcolm wrote:

Since this is a question of life and death, one should not wave around flaccid opinions. As a Dharma practitioner, you have an obligation to observe the principle of nonharming. The Buddha clearly identified trade in weapons as an incorrect, harmful livelihood.

I don't think you can rationally defend the way guns are deregulated in the US.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 3:04 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

tomamundsen said:

I disagree. I'm not keen on the government taking away citizens' rights and further tipping the scales of power into their hands.

Malcolm wrote:

So you think that continuing to allow military grade weapons to be sold on the open market is desirable or even sane?

tomamundsen said:

As far as I know, military grade weapons (fully-automatic) are not sold on the open market. "Assault weapons" are not military grade, although some of them cosmetically resemble military grade weapons.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no difference between an AR-15 and an M-16 apart from one tiny part (the auto-sear). That part that is difference between the two guns (i.e. the difference between semi-automatic and fully automatic).

Leaving that aside, why would anyone need a semi-automatic rifle to go hunting?

Guns are useless for self-defense unless you carry them all the time. Where is that necessary outside of a war zone? Is the US a war zone?

The 2nd Amendment has to do with maintaining a militia, it has nothing to do with providing a means for citizens to defend themselves against the government. It became obsolete with the civil war.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

tomamundsen said:

I also don't smoke crack, but I don't think it should be illegal for people to purchase hardcore drugs.

Malcolm wrote:

This is definitely a false equivalence. You can't gun people down with a bag of crack.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, it is time, long overdue, for us to seriously address the issue of gun control.

Queequeg said:

yes.

does anyone disagree?

tomamundsen said:

I disagree. I'm not keen on the government taking away citizens' rights and further tipping the scales of power into their hands.

Malcolm wrote:

So you think that continuing to allow military grade weapons to be sold on the open market is desirable or even sane?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, it is time, long overdue, for us to seriously address the issue of gun control.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

Queequeg said:

Those terms have different meaning for us.

kirtu said:

No they do not. You are deliberately trying to control and mangle language so as to restrict thought. Just like much of American 1984 speak which flows so naturally from a people long since trained from birth to manipulate and obfuscate.

Queequeg said:

Ah, I wish I was so deliberate.

I'm explaining that in colloquial terms, this is what people mean. You can deny this, but right or wrong, this is how many Americans speak and think.

Trust me, I'm not the Tea Party Fascist you seem to think I am.

Malcolm wrote:

Kirt thinks all Americans, excluding himself of course, are Tea Party Fascists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

ISIS can actually provide scriptural justification for everything they do. Islam has no centralized authority or pope to codify scriptural interpretation, so its basically a free-for all as far as picking and choosing ayahs and hadiths to justify your actions and attitudes. Because of this, it is basically not true to accuse ISIS of "perverting Islam" or of "not being muslims". They just have a particularly extreme interpretation of the

scriptures.

Malcolm wrote:

Thus, there is no such thing as Radical Islam, only radicalized muslims.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Update on Orlando Shooting

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Yes that is true of Muslim governments, but has nothing to do with your point that somehow "Islam" as some monolithic entity is to blame, especially since so many people within these countries are hugely dissatisfied with their governments. You keep saying "Islam" is a certain way, but there is no one thing called Islam at all...

Rakz said:

There is something called Radical Islam. Yes? No?

Malcolm wrote:

No, but there is such a thing as "radicalized muslims," however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 17th, 2016 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's argument for his "interpretive free" translation style

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

OK, thanks. While we're on the topic can you say something about why DJKR would say... when Vairotsana translated the word shunyata, he considered it from many angles and came up with tong pa-nyi, which expresses a lot of potential, the complete opposite of the word "empty".

as quoted above? How is it that 'stong pa nyid' expresses a lot of potential, if you agree with this statement?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the word stong pa has several meanings in Tibetan. It's primary meaning is isolation (dben pa) or exhaustion (zad par 'gyur ba). It also can bear the meaning of ripen (smin pa) and benefit (phan pa); it's a kind of pulse, it is a phase of the moon; it also refers to a void space, for example, the emptiness of a pot that has nothing in it.

I would be very surprised if in fact Vairocana was the one who came up with the term stong pa nyid for śūnyatā. It is not impossible, but what is the real evidence for it?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2016 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's argument for his "interpretive free" translation style

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For example, someone brought up the example of " stong pa nyid " as a translation for śūnyatā. Śūnyatā was originally translated into Tibetan as " ye 'byams." Very few people are aware of this, and so we run into rather strange translations of the term, not realizing it translated śūnyatā. So what to do? Do we translate it as "having always been without limitations?," "having always overflowed?," two quite literal translations of the term? Or do we use the very loose approximation "timeless infinity," as one translator suggests? Or do we translate it as emptiness, as we generally translate stong pa nyid?

dzogchungpa said:

This is interesting. How would you translate it?

Malcolm wrote:

Generally, in Dzogchen texts in man ngag sde, where it occasionally occurs, it should probably be rendered as something like "fundamentally/originally/primordially limitless" with a note that it is a gloss on the term śūnyatā.

Orna Almogi comments in Rong-zom-pa's Discourses on Buddhology, pg. 162, footnote 64:

Compare the term ye 'byams, which is an old designation for emptiness (Śūnyatā: stong pa nyid)

and is still used in the rNying-ma tradition in this sense. Although the term is often translated as

'primordial field,' such an understanding does not seem to be lexically attested, It is conceivable

that here, too, the component ye was initially employed in the sense of 'totality.' In this case, the

term ye 'byams would literally mean 'total/complete openness/expanse,' that is, 'emptiness.' As in

the case of the term ye shes, however, I have not been able to locate any Tibetan source to support

such an etymology, Note also the meaning of the Zhang-zhung word ye sangs, which according to

Martin 2004, S.v., is equivalent, among other things, to Tibetan stong, that is, 'empty,' 'void.'

dzogchungpa said:

Also, could you say more about the rationale for the original translation and subsequent revision?

Malcolm wrote:

Lost to history, perhaps it was overtly influenced by early translations of sūtras from Chinese into Tibetan. As it stands now the term is quite rare, though it makes an appearance in some sems sde texts and in the Treasury of the Dharmadhātu and Resting into the Nature of the Mind by Longchenpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2016 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's argument for his "interpretive free" translation style

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

I'm about to say something unpopular. Unless, a text is produced by a lama who transmits it, it is useful only for occasional cross reference.

Malcolm wrote:

There wont be many translations then.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 16th, 2016 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: Keith Dowman's argument for his "interpretive free" translation style

Content:

krodha said:

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.

Malcolm wrote:

I can't speak to what other translators do or don't do. And of course more than one scholar has taken issue with Dowman's translations, the same applies to Tony Duff, etc. But that is not very important. Why? We would be very foolish to think that after translating Dharma texts into English for a generation that we are in any position to stake out definite positions about how things could or should be translated into English.

For example, someone brought up the example of " stong pa nyid " as a translation for śūnyatā. Śūnyatā was originally translated into Tibetan as " ye 'byams." Very few people are aware of this, and so we run into rather strange translations of the term, not realizing it translated śūnyatā. So what to do? Do we translate it as "having always been without limitations?," "having always overflowed?," two quite literal translations of the term? Or do we use the very loose approximation "timeless infinity," as one translator suggests? Or do we translate it as emptiness, as we generally translate stong pa nyid?

Someone else mentioned committee translations. In my opinion, the quality of a translations depends on the committee, who did the original, who edited it, and so on. The failure of translation committees is the desire to create a brand, like different

models of cars. Different translations from the same committee exhibit different levels of accuracy and quality depending on the composition of the actual team. Even among Tibetans, those who are educated in Shedras may not actually have the knowledge of Dzogchen for example, to accurately give information when questioned about the usage of term such as la zla ba.

The quality of a translation also depends very much on the ability of a person to express themselves well in their native tongue. Poor writers make poor translations. There are other factors: are you a native English speaker? Even the best of the non-native translators, not just Guenther, quite often make choices which are quite frankly nonidiomatic English and are strange in our language. Do you speak British, American, Canadian, Australian or Indian English? One's choice of words, one's compositional style, and so on, will all very much be influenced by the country and education one has.

Then there are other factors: people who have never translated anything other than Dharma texts tend to have a very brittle and dry style, because Dharma texts from the traditions of Madhyamaka and so on are exactly that, dry and brittle taxonomies which give very little indication of or possibility for process.

For myself personally, studying Tibetan Medicine opened up a whole new way of looking at Tibetan to which I previously had been blind. Biographies too demand a somewhat more personable style. In general, one modern fault of we Tibetan translators is a lack of diversity in our reading. I know of professors, much hailed for their translation of philosophical texts, who cannot handle that most simplistic of formats, the sadhana, with any skill at all. I have watched famous translators badly botch explanations given by Lamas because the translator had no knowledge of Tibetan Medicine and was therefore unable to accurately translate some concepts from a Dzogchen text, and amazingly just make up some bullshit on the spot, apparently to cover up their own ignorance. That said, I also have sympathy for oral translators, it is no easy job. Oral translators usually are not such good text translators, and the reverse is also true. There are very few translators who excel at both. As an oral translator, for example, I suck.

Then there is the issue of "helping" the text. It is the habit of some translators to embed their understanding in their translations by fleshing them out, sometimes by as much as 40 percent, with extraneous material either derived from commentaries or from information provided in the course of hearing a text being taught. Other translations are leaner, more austere, tending to stick more closely to the text, depending on the reader's familiarity with the subject. Is this good, bad? How can we say it is either, when Tibetan translators themselves have often embellished?

If anything, translators of texts should find themselves humbled by the process. There is little glory in it. The translation process is driven by a passion for discovering the unknown, the unread. Principally, Dharma translation should be driven by the motivation to deepen one's own practice, and to aid others. It can be especially disheartening in the beginning because you are mostly wrong all the time; but of course in the end, when one can share texts that have never been seen in English, it is deeply rewarding because of the joy it brings to oneself through deeper understanding and the

joy it brings to others because it is like giving the blind eyes to see, however imperfect those eyes may be and still in need of correction.

While I certainly admit to having my preferences in both translation terms as well as translators, in general we should try to be supportive of the efforts of translators and not give them too hard a time. This does not mean that people cannot discuss this or that term and its suitability. Most people do not realize that a majority of texts translated from Sanskrit to Tibetan, especially the more important texts, underwent multiple revisions, a process that began in the mid-8th century and ended only in the 14th century. There exist dictionaries of archaic terms and their modern (i.e. post-Ralpagan) equivalents. Translators themselves should do their own research and not depend so heavily on translations made two, three, four, and five decades ago. Translators must question why for example we are translating *ye shes* as "primordial wisdom," *rig pa* as awareness, etc. We must not fall into formulaic translations, because in the end we will wind up with the very clumsy, basically unreadable translations done by Tibetans after the 14th century.

I would only caution those translators who are much given to criticizing the work of others that such criticism merely opens the door for rebuttal and criticism in turn, and this helps no one in the end. People may wish to ignore this fact, but translation is a crowd-sourced process. The more eyes there are on our translations, the more accurate they can in time become.

I am sharing these thoughts with you because the question arose and because I have spent the last 24 years of my life obeying my guru, Ngakpa Yeshe Dorje's command that I become a translator. In that time I have translated many texts, made even more mistakes, and have had my own pride and arrogance knocked down again and again (as hard as it may seem for some of you to believe) by the process of translation.

I will share with you one of my guiding principles in translating Dzogchen texts into English, since that is really what this thread is about. Rongzom states that while the words of the Great Perfection are simple, their meaning is vast and deep like space. On the other hand, the words of the lower vehicles are very precise and detailed in their complexity, but their meaning is rough, just like a pile of dust. Therefore, as much as possible, when translating the texts of the Great Perfection, I try to keep my English as simple and plain as I can.

However there are some other principles that I also observe summarized here: <http://www3.dbu.edu/mitchell/poundtra.htm>, and based on the work of Ezra Pound.

1) A true translation must reject "Wardour-Street English," the pseudo-archaic language of Victorian translators associated with William Morris and F. W. Newman. Pound was willing to experiment with a variety of poetic style and diction. He made free-verse translations of classical works acceptable.

2) Each translation is a kind of criticism of the original. It stresses the strengths of the original, but it also shows what its limits may have been.

3) No translation has to reproduce all aspects of the original. It can choose to concentrate on only some aspects. It can leave part of the original out. It may even add to it or rearrange it in order to accomplish the translator's purpose.

4) Modern topical allusions may be used to bring across the emotions associated with the original's allusions.

5) Translations should be new poems in their own right. They should be artistically well-done. (while this refers to poems, it applies to everything)

6) History is a product of the present. All knowledge of the past is experienced in our current reception and reading of it. In this sense, all translation is both a continuity and a re-reading of past texts and authors.

One may find much food for thought on this Wiki page too:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Translation>

Finally, another point that many people don't understand. Poetry and Prosody (Kavya) are distinct from the style of Karika literature of Indo-Tibetan religio-philosophical texts. Texts from the Samcayagathas to the Precious Treasury of the Dharmadhātu are not poetry, nor are they intended as poetry. The so called "verse" portions of the tantras emulate the gathas of sūtra, and so too are not poetry, but are in metered verses to aid memorization. While such compositions can be "poetic," it must be firmly understood they are not poems in our sense of the word. True poetry in the Indo-Tibetan traditions is a very specific, very highly stylized form which is generally confined to the so called "verses of praise" and the dedications found in the beginning and end of texts, ranging from short texts to multivolume treatises, and whose complexity and depth depends very much on the education of the author. Real poetry in Tibetan can be pretty boring reading, depending on deep familiarity with the synonyms which may be found in the compendium Amarakośa and its commentary. For example, a common synonym for the sun is "The one who is drawn by seven horses."

So, in the end, it is better to be light-handed in our criticisms of translators and their translations unless they are engaged in gross fabrications or outright plagiarism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 14th, 2016 at 8:19 PM

Title: Re: Disillusioned by gradual teachings

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen Community, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu is what you may be looking for.

In Dzogchen, the so called direct teachings are given up front, then you find your own level based on what you understand. Thus, it is the opposite of what you have been led

to believe.

Temicco said:

Yeah, just seems kind of hard (in my very limited experience, granted) to find groups that are like this. The only group in my city that offers ngondro more or less straight away is Rigpa, which has its controversies. Nalandabodhi requires multiple years of study before even starting ngondro, for instance.

Nobody teaches Chan like that anymore. But I know it's kind of a petty concern.

Dan74 said:

I think this is not so. There are some incredible Chan teachers and if they teach more gradual approaches, it is because they see that this is what their students need.

In fact, believing you are too good to waste time on gradual teachings probably means the best practice for you is 100000 prostrations to knock these spiritual materialistic ideas out of your head. But I may be wrong. That's why you need a teacher who can get to know you and have the wisdom to advise appropriately.

/

Temicco said:

Yeah, I definitely do. And the prostrations are likely needed I actually hope to start ngondro within the next few months; still kind of "shopping around" to see what kind of options I have.

Do you have any particular people in mind when you mention "incredible Chan teachers"?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 14th, 2016 at 10:01 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in three incalculable eons an improbable venture.

Content:

Astus said:

It all depends on how one counts those aeons.

Malcolm wrote:

Cooking the Dharma books....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2016 at 7:32 PM

Title: Re: Shantideva, Way of the Bodhisattva -- Stay away from "childish beings" or help them?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It means avoid the company of fools.

prsvrnc said:

I am reading chapter 8 of Shantideva's, "the Way of the Bodhisattva" on Meditative Concentration along with a commentary. Many of the verses in this chapter talk about how you should remain in solitude and list many reasons for why it is not worth one's time to remain in the presence of most beings. I realize this might be in context of developing meditative concentration, but the way it's written makes it sound like this is advice for any scenario.

Verses 15 and 16:

"Therefore flee the company of childish people.
Greet them, when you meet, with smiles
That keep on terms of common courtesy,
Without inviting intimate relations.

Like bees that get their honey from the flowers,
Take only what will serve the practice of the Dharma.
Treat everyone like new acquaintances
And keep yourself from close familiarity."

^^^ How do you all interpret this? I realize it doesn't have to be contradictory, but I'm curious how this squares with the bodhisattva commitment to help all beings. In my own mind, i have some friends that are difficult (for example), bUt I see my remaining friends with them as something that could be an aid to them in some way. How do you guys interpret this?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2016 at 7:24 PM

Title: Re: Difference views on fetters and kilesas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Astus,

The point is that what you are describing is an intellectual view that is meaningless outside of the context of a teacher student relationship, where such a view is integrated meaningfully with practice. There is no liberation through words, my friend, as your final citation points out.

It is funny to watch ordinary people like us confidentially opine on awakening, it is like watching children playing at being royalty.

This is all very nice, Astus, but what you are describing is just an intellectual view thst wont help one deal with affluctions at all.

Astus said:

What view is not intellectual? The teachings are all made of words. How one uses them decides if they are of any help. Even Bodhidharma
<http://ctzen.org/sunnyvale/enBodhiDharmaSutraWithAnnotation.htm> the direct entrance as "to awaken to the Truth through the doctrine". And direct entrance is where the teaching of afflictions are bodhi belongs to:

"In the Ultimate Vehicle, we neither transform our afflictions nor extinguish them; our mind is originally pure and lucid. This mind is inherent in everyone; we do not need to seek it externally. This is the Chan School's principle of "affliction is bodhi; birth and death (samsara) is nirvana.""

(http://ctzen.org/sunnyvale/enUS/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=219&Itemid=59)

As for teaching it, here's a short story.

For a long time Yaoshan did not enter the hall to speak.

The temple director said to him, "The monks have been waiting for a long time for the master to give them some instruction."

Yaoshan said, "Ring the bell!"

The monks assembled in the hall.

Yaoshan then got down from the Dharma seat and went back to the abbot's quarters.

The temple director followed him and said, "Master, since you consented to speak to the monks, why didn't you say anything?"

Yaoshan said, "Sutras have sutra teachers. Shastras have shastra teachers. Why are you unhappy with me?"

(Zen's Chinese Heritage, p 124-125)

So, what is there to do with views and words?

"The more words and thoughts the more you will go astray.

Stop speaking, stop thinking and there is nothing you cannot understand."

(<http://www.sacred-texts.com/bud/zen/fm/fm.htm>)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2016 at 6:41 PM

Title: Re: Difference views on fetters and kilesas?

Content:

Saoshun said:

This is all very nice, Astus, but what you are describing is just an intellectual view that won't help one deal with afflictions at all.

This is actually fetter too.

Malcolm wrote:

Its fetters all, they way down.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2016 at 10:24 AM

Title: Re: Disillusioned by gradual teachings

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In Dzogchen, the so called direct teachings are given up front, then you find your own level based on what you understand. Thus, it is the opposite of what you have been led to believe.

Boomerang said:

I'm not sure if I understand the question.

Gradual paths are available for those who have the karma to excel at them. Non-gradual paths, for those who have that karma. What's the problem?

Temicco said:

It basically just feels that the only way you can get to non-gradual teachings to see if they even work for you is through a long process of, more or less, jumping through gradual, path-based hoops. This process will either a) be kind of a waste of time and potentially delusive, or b) really helpful. And if TB considers most people to be lamrimpas, then I get why administering such a path for the 95% of people who will benefit from it is the best idea. It's just frustrating that the more direct teachings are kind of locked away at the top of the vehicles, as opposed to being more immediately accessible.

tomamundsen said:

I think there is a difference between how things are presented to the public and then how things actually work out once you build a relationship with a teacher. If you have the capacity for the "higher" practices, I don't think the teacher will be reluctant to give them to you. Things are presented more formally to public audiences, but working with a teacher eventually becomes a really personal thing and you will get whichever practices are best suited for you. I guess I shouldn't speak generally, I doubt everyone's experience is that way. But I do think that if you create a genuine connection with a teacher, you won't be disappointed and feel like things are being held back from you. It could be the case that you are instructed to engage in more gradual teachings, but if you trust in your teacher fully, there won't be an issue.

Temicco said:

That's a good point. But then, part of my concern is related to the (apparent) fixedness of the lamrimpa/cigcarba categories in Tibetan thinking -- Chan doesn't make such a big deal out of karmically determined capacity, and mainly discusses it as a point of sectarianism (in that Chan doesn't cater to people of lower capacities). In Chan you never hear, "won't realize it because of your karma", you hear, "you won't realize it because you persist in these bad habits, even though you don't have to". A subtle difference, but a big one. Would getting pinned as someone of lower capacity by one Tibetan teacher follow me throughout my studies like some kind of past failed class?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2016 at 9:41 AM

Title: Re: Difference views on fetters and kilesas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is all very nice, Astus, but what you are describing is just an intellectual view that won't help one deal with afflictions at all.

Then, please explain the difference between mere indifference (to thoughts) and liberation (from attachment to thoughts).

Astus said:

Indifference is a concept where one deems something uninteresting or irrelevant.

Liberation means not abiding in any concept, neither grasping nor rejecting.

Yes, so, what does it look like to become free of attachment to thoughts? How does one actually do that?

If you think that none of the passages already quoted answer that, then here is the instruction for zazen:

"When you are aware that all characteristics are void, it is true mind,

http://buddhiststudies.berkeley.edu/people/faculty/sharf/documents/Sharf_Mindfulness%20and%20Mindlessness.pdf. If a thought arises, be aware of it; once you are aware of it, it will disappear. The excellent gate of practice lies here alone."

(Zongmi on Chan, p 88; same in <http://global.sotozen-net.or.jp/eng/practice/zazen/howto/index.html> and <http://zen.rinnou.net/zazen/sitting.html>)

Again, this is a prescription, not a description. How does one purify the fundamental mind? (I assume he means here the ālayavijñāna).

The fundamental mind (本心) is one's original buddha nature. To purify it means to see it, to recognise that it is originally pure.

What does "realizing emptiness" actually mean and how does one do it. Descriptions please, no more prescriptions, we have had enough of these already.

If Zen and prajnaparamita do not match your criteria for descriptions, there are all sorts of other manuals.

What awakening are you trying to describe? How do you do it?

I have described awakening as seeing the insubstantiality of afflictions. Regarding methods, there are numerous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2016 at 3:43 AM

Title: Re: Disillusioned by gradual teachings

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So, if TB is not your cup of (butter) tea, why don't you quit whining and just go and continue practicing Chan?

Temicco said:

Nobody teaches Chan like that anymore. But I know it's kind of a petty concern.

Malcolm wrote:

If you know how Chan was taught, then why do you need a teacher?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2016 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so you are saying that one only acquires the problem by accepting Buddhadharma in the first place, and only Buddhists are subject to "rebirth in samsara"? Since you say "taking a cure for a disease one does not have" you imply that non-Buddhists are not subject to "rebirth in samsara".

Malcolm wrote:

You can look at it like that, if you choose.

From the perspective of Buddhadharma, on the other hand, you are subject to rebirth whether you choose to accept this fact or not. And guess what, that is not a falsifiable statement. But rebirth is the fundamental problem Buddha provided a solution for. It is up to you to accept this or not, but no one can prove rebirth to you. It can easily be shown however that whatever "therapies" the Buddha devised, they were devised to cure this problem, i.e., rebirth.

gad rgyangs said:

there is quite a bit of anecdotal evidence to support some kind of rebirth, although it is not at all clear in what way the other lifetimes could be considered "yours". There could simply be bleed-over of memories, perhaps even transmitted through genetics or some other mechanism. The point is we simply do not know and I do not believe there is anything to be gained by picking out unknowns at random and declaring them "unnegotiable". There is plenty that can be investigated within what we actually experience.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that there is no reason to be delicate about what rebirth is at all. It is a well described phenomena, and is universally understood in every Dharma path including Dzogchen.

Pussyfooting around it is a waste of time.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2016 at 3:12 AM
Title: Re: Illusion
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
so you see Buddhadharma as a creed rather than as a methodology?

Malcolm wrote:
Buddhadharma sets out a very specific set of problems, and proposes solutions to the problems it identifies. If one does not accept the problem Buddhadharma identifies (rebirth in samsara), there is no point in following its methodology. It would be like taking a cure for a disease one does not have, such a cure in fact can only cause one to become ill.

gad rgyangs said:
so you are saying that one only acquires the problem by accepting Buddhadharma in the first place, and only Buddhists are subject to "rebirth in samsara"? Since you say "taking a cure for a disease one does not have" you imply that non-Buddhists are not subject to "rebirth in samsara".

Malcolm wrote:
You can look at it like that, if you choose.

From the perspective of Buddhadharma, on the other hand, you are subject to rebirth whether you choose to accept this fact or not. And guess what, that is not a falsifiable statement. But rebirth is the fundamental problem Buddha provided a solution for. It is up to you to accept this or not, but no one can prove rebirth to you. It can easily be shown however that whatever "therapies" the Buddha devised, they were devised to cure this problem, i.e., rebirth.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2016 at 3:01 AM
Title: Re: Illusion
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
Unfortunately, in Buddhadharma, the karma hypothesis, whether falsifiable or not according to some imagined objective standard, is nonnegotiable, as is rebirth.

gad rgyangs said:
so you see Buddhadharma as a creed rather than as a methodology?

Malcolm wrote:
Buddhadharma sets out a very specific set of problems, and proposes solutions to the problems it identifies. If one does not accept the problem Buddhadharma identifies

(rebirth in samsara), there is no point in following its methodology. It would be like taking a cure for a disease one does not have, such a cure in fact can only cause one to become ill.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2016 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

there doesn't seem to be any evidence either way, therefore it is simply an unsupported hypothesis.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are looking for empirical validation of anything in Buddhadharma, well, I advise you to return to your "therapeutic Buddhism," because you will certainly be disappointed.

gad rgyangs said:

the idea of Buddha as doctor is nothing new, so I'm not sure why you keep using the term sarcastically. I would say that we can actually apply the idea that we cause much of our suffering through attachment and see that it is true based on our own experience. the karma hypothesis, at least as it is presented in traditional Buddhism, is untestable.

Malcolm wrote:

Great, so you are a Secular Buddhist, hurrah!

All religions propose solutions to suffering, so they are all "theapies" for someone. They all provide solutions to suffering, and their proponents claim that in their own experience their suffering is lessened and even eliminated.

Why pick Buddhadharma above say Hinduism, Christianity, Islam, etc?

Unfortunately, in Buddhadharma, the karma hypothesis, whether falsifiable or not according to some imagined objective standard, is nonnegotiable, as is rebirth.

Buddha was indeed a great physician (not a therapist, massage or otherwise), who diagnosed the disease, afflictive rebirth, and prescribes its cure, Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2016 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Difference views on fetters and kilesas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So the only difference between buddhas and sentient beings is attachment to thoughts?

Astus said:

What more needed?

Malcolm wrote:

Then, please explain the difference between mere indifference (to thoughts) and liberation (from attachment to thoughts).

Astus said:

This gets back to the question you have not answered, how does the mind become free from afflictions, since this is necessary preconditions for what you are describing as nonconceptuality (nirvikalpa)?

Afflictions come from attachment to thoughts. Once there is no attachment, there are no afflictions either. The quoted line from the Platform Sutra continues as follows:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, so, what does it look like to become free of attachment to thoughts? How does one actually do that?

Astus said:

"[The mind's] functioning pervades all locations, yet it is not attached to all the locations. Just purify the fundamental mind, causing the six consciousnesses to emerge from the six [sensory] gates, [causing one to be] without defilement or heterogeneity within the six types of sensory data (literally, the "six dusts"), autonomous in the coming and going [of mental phenomena], one's penetrating function without stagnation."

(Platform Sutra, ch 2, BDK p 33)

Malcolm wrote:

Again, this is a prescription, not a description. How does one purify the fundamental mind? (I assume he means here the ālayavijñāna).

Astus said:

Nagarjuna writes as well:

"Liberation follows from the exhaustion of action and affliction.

Action and affliction are due to thought,

And thoughts proliferate due to mental construction.

They are brought to an end by emptiness."

(MMK 18.5, tr from Ornament of Reason)

Malcolm wrote:

Again, this does not explain how, it merely explains what.

Astus said:

Affliction and clinging comes from not seeing emptiness. Since names are empty, there is no problem, when it is realised.

Malcolm wrote:

A lot of people here "see emptiness", we discuss it all day long, are expert in many arguments about emptiness. But for all this talk of emptiness, I don't really see anyone waking up. What does "realizing emptiness" actually mean and how does one do it.

Descriptions please, no more prescriptions, we have had enough of these already.

Astus said:

I see, so there is apprehension of characteristics, but you don't "grasp" them. Well, many people also understand this and practice this way, and yet, they still are not awakened. I still think you have failed to escape intellectualism here. What awakening is it you miss?

Malcolm wrote:

What awakening are you trying to describe? How do you do it?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2016 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

what is the evidence that this true?

Malcolm wrote:

What is the evidence it isn't?

gad rgyangs said:

there doesn't seem to be any evidence either way, therefore it is simply an unsupported hypothesis.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are looking for empirical validation of anything in Buddhadharma, well, I advise you to return to your "therapeutic Buddhism," because you will certainly be disappointed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2016 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

Vasana said:

Until all of ones thoughts are self arisen and self liberated , then they entail the generation of karma.

gad rgyangs said:

what is the evidence that this true?

Malcolm wrote:

What is the evidence it isn't?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2016 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

sorry to hear you are bored by buddhism and the quest to understand the nature of reality. maybe its just a phase.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Buddhism is a crashing bore. Dharma, well, that is another matter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2016 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

how do you justify saying that sense appearances are an aspect of our clarity, but our apprehensions are not?

Malcolm wrote:

Why justify anything? — all it does is produce discursive responses that never end. And then, bored silly at the endless questions....well, time to change the channel.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 12th, 2016 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Difference views on fetters and kilesas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Many people continue to grasp even though they know characteristics are concepts. So, there is still something missing. Your presentation is completely intellectual.

Astus said:

Grasping is always at characteristics. If one does not conceive characteristics, how can there be grasping?

Malcolm wrote:

How does one perceive without perceiving characteristics?

Astus said:

What many people may know and still continue to grasp at objects are words, that is, grasping at characteristics, imagining that emptiness is another thing.

Malcolm wrote:

There are many people who do not have this fault, thinking that emptiness is one thing, characteristics are another, and yet, they have not woken up.

Astus said:

Enlightenment is naturally true and is fundamentally without names. It is only that people of the world do not recognize it and remain deluded within their ratiocination.

Malcolm wrote:

How can something without characteristics be recognized?

Astus said:

So how do you do that (realize and manifest them)?

So what is the different between a buddha and the unconscious devas. Both have stopped thinking.

It is not thoughtlessness, but not grasping at thoughts.

Malcolm wrote:

So the only difference between buddhas and sentient beings is attachment to thoughts?

Astus said:

"What is nonthought? If in seeing all the dharmas, the mind is not defiled or attached, this is nonthought.

Malcolm wrote:

This gets back to the question you have not answered, how does the mind become free from afflictions, since this is necessary preconditions for what you are describing as nonconceptuality (nirvikalpa)?

Astus said:

I see, so there is no ultimate.
Is there such a thing as "pure absence"?

Malcolm wrote:
How could there be?

Astus said:
So there are names.
Even names are without characteristics.

Malcolm wrote:
That does not settle anything, since as you admit above affliction and clinging is the problem, not characteristics.

Astus said:
Thinking that there is no essence is grasping at an essence. To recognise in one's present experience that there is nothing that can be grasped is what is meant by seeing characteristics to be fictional.

Malcolm wrote:
[/quote]

I see, so there is apprehension of characteristics, but you don't "grasp" them. Well, many people also understand this and practice this way, and yet, they still are not awakened. I still think you have failed to escape intellectualism here.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2016 at 9:29 PM
Title: Re: Difference views on fetters and kilesas?
Content:

Astus said:
Marks/characteristics are concepts. As long as one believes those concepts to be substantial, there is clinging. Once they are seen as merely conceptual, there is nothing left to grasp.

Malcolm wrote:
Many people continue to grasp even though they know characteristics are concepts. So, there is still something missing. Your presentation is completely intellectual.

Astus said:
It answers it by showing how while we all have the qualities of a buddha, it doesn't mean we realise and manifest them.

Malcolm wrote:

So how do you do that (realize and manifest them)?

Astus said:

...They do not understand that if they cease their thoughts and end their thinking, the Buddha will automatically be present."

Malcolm wrote:

So what is the different between a buddha and the unconscious devas. Both have stopped thinking.

Astus said:

The ultimate is seeing the conventional as conventional.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so there is no ultimate.

Astus said:

We use words (i.e. names) here all the time, don't we?

Malcolm wrote:

So there are names.

Astus said:

There is ignorance about and awakening to phenomena as inessential.

Malcolm wrote:

But this is still just intellectualism. Many people here understand that phenomena are inessential, and yet, they are not awake. There is still something missing from your presentation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2016 at 8:19 PM

Title: Re: Disillusioned by gradual teachings

Content:

Temicco said:

I study Chan, which is highly critical of gradual path- and practice-based approaches. Although the following passage is Dzogchen, it quite nicely sums up the Chan position:

Vairocana said:

Innocents enter a structured path of dharma practice with no chance to realize that it leads nowhere:

how can reality ever be found by seeking?

...

The nature of the miraculous ambrosia
does not depend upon any technique.

Temicco said:

I've been somewhat skeptical of "practices" of liberation since I first got into Chan (how could liberation be confined to the enactment of a practice or produced through some method? It just doesn't make sense), but the fact that multiple groups within Buddhism ultimately agree just makes me feel kind of annoyed. If Dzogchen's where it's at (now that pure Chan is dead), why would I pay a Tibetan Buddhist centre to give me some raft to delude myself with? I'd really like to get to things directly, and it feels like that's an ideal that's impossible in reality. That my attachment to non-gradual teachings is something for me to investigate is definitely true, but doesn't really hit my main concern. Why am I expected and encouraged to tarry in samsara when I'm already interested in the dharma and want the heart of the matter?

Malcolm wrote:

The reason why you are in samsara is because you are afflicted. Most people have to gradually penetrate their afflictions. When they are free from being controlled by afflictions, they are liberated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2016 at 8:10 PM

Title: Re: Difference views on fetters and kilesas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

How does one relinquish marks that do not exist? And if it is the case that one must relinquish marks, is it not also the case that one must relinquish the afflictions that cause clinging to marks?

Astus said:

The part I quoted from PP8000 (22.2) asks the same question and answers in the following way:

Malcolm wrote:

This is prescriptive and not descriptive.

Astus said:

Then everyone is a great master of Chan.
All beings have the buddha-nature.

Malcolm wrote:

This is is not an answer.

Astus said:

But, as <http://www.ymba.org/books/entering-tao-sudden-enlightenment/tsung-ching-record>:

"While they are eating, they are not really eating due to too much thinking. While they are sleeping, they are not really sleeping due to too much mental agitation. Therefore, they do not work in the same way I do."

Malcolm wrote:

But why?

Astus said:

The ultimate is just a pure absence. How can that be all the conventional is?

The conventional is just the conventional. Its substance is absent.

Malcolm wrote:

So there is something other than the ultimate?

Astus said:

In Linji's words (tr Sasaki, p 19):

"All the dharmas of this world and of the worlds beyond are without self-nature. Also, they are without produced nature. They are just empty names, and these names are also empty. All you are doing is taking these worthless names to be real. That's all wrong!"

And in <http://sutasmantras.info/sutra13.html>:

Malcolm wrote:

So there are names? Or not.

Astus said:

"Just as self is only a name, so too Buddha is only a name. Realizing the emptiness of a name is bodhi. One should seek bodhi without using names. The appearance of bodhi is free from words. Why? Because words and bodhi are both empty."

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

So your basic conclusion is that there is no awakening, and therefore, the whole thing is a farce.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2016 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Difference views on fetters and kilesas?

Content:
Malcolm wrote:
No idea what your stance on ultimate truth is.

AlexMcLeod said:
See signature. Basically, it is irrelevant to most discussions, Dharmic or otherwise. This is simply because of the level of attainment of most everyone. My belief is that it is a form of nihilism in most cases and subjects.

That is why I am constantly arguing against its use in discussions.

Malcolm wrote:
There is no problem discussing ultimate truth, one needs to have a conventional understanding of it in order to realize it. Per Nāgārjuna.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2016 at 1:10 AM
Title: Re: Difference views on fetters and kilesas?
Content:

AlexMcLeod said:
Either that or he's had some mystical experience that has placed him in agreement with my stance on ultimate truth...but I doubt it.

Malcolm wrote:
No idea what your stance on ultimate truth is.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2016 at 1:08 AM
Title: Re: Difference views on fetters and kilesas?
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
I also know there are no characteristics. So you are still leaving something out.

Astus said:
If it's not the difference between thinking and doing, then please tell what you mean.

Malcolm wrote:
How does one relinquish marks that do not exist? And if it is the case that one must relinquish marks, is it not also the case that one must relinquish the afflictions that cause clinging to marks?

Astus said:
That's why people think Chan is nihilistic.

It is quite the opposite, very much life affirming and down to earth. The only true Chan practices are eat, shit, sleep.

Malcolm wrote:

Then everyone is a great master of Chan.

Astus said:

Wasn't it just recently that in some thread you were emphasising how everything is illusion? I mean, that must sound nihilistic as well then.

Malcolm wrote:

The ultimate is just a pure absence. How can that be all the conventional is?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 11th, 2016 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Difference views on fetters and kilesas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I see phenomena as insubstantial. Am I awakened? (Answer: no) I recognize all phenomena as equal. Am I awakened? (Answer: no) So there must be something else you are leaving out.

Astus said:

What would that be?

"The mark of self is no mark. The mark of others, the mark of living beings, and the mark of a life are no marks. And why? Those who have relinquished all marks are called Buddhas."

(http://www.buddhistdoor.com/OldWeb/bdoor/archive/sutra_comm/diamond/diamond_02.htm#d14)

Malcolm wrote:

I also know there are no characteristics. So you are still leaving something out.

Astus said:

All these say that from the point of ultimate truth. But not from the point of view of relative truth. You must distinguish the two truths.

They talk about what should be clear, that the conventional reality is just conventional, and that is all the ultimate there is.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

That's why people think Chan is nihilistic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2016 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Difference views on fetters and kilesas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Lame, Astus. Everything is without substance, that does not mean that everything is awakened.

Astus said:

Seeing them to be insubstantial is awakening, and recognising all phenomena to be equal (samsara=nirvana).\

Malcolm wrote:

I see phenomena as insubstantial. Am I awakened? (Answer: no) I recognize all phenomena as equal. Am I awakened? (Answer: no) So there must be something else you are leaving out.

Astus said:

...

Malcolm wrote:

All these say that from the point of ultimate truth. But not from the point of view of relative truth. You must distinguish the two truths.

And yes, I can find citations that both support this idea and negate it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2016 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Difference views on fetters and kilesas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Your citations from the MMK don't say that. They merely state that afflictions are not ultimately real.

Astus said:

I cited the MMK only to give something from Nagarjuna related to the topic. But practically the quote backs up with reasoning what the sutras say on the matter, since once the afflictions are seen to be without substance, there is nothing to do about them and they are equal to enlightenment.

Malcolm wrote:

Lame, Astus. Everything is without substance, that does not mean that everything is awakened. (Enlightenment is such a stupid word for bodhi).

You need a quote.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2016 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: The case against lawns

Content:

Ayu said:

Grasland is wilderness. Very different to lawn.

Malcolm wrote:

Did you note that I said this:

BTW, I am not defending lawns, since they are nothing like sod. And of course dry grasslands, are well, dry. But not all are, such as the Pampas in S. America, etc.

Ayu said:

No, sorry, where did you say that?

But I didn't think you were defending lawns. My point was, lawns and grassland shouldn't be equated. I think: let the things grow as they want. Even gras.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, grass gets thicker the more it is mowed, and or rotationally grazed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2016 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: The case against lawns

Content:

Ayu said:

Grasland is wilderness. Very different to lawn.

Malcolm wrote:

Did you note that I said this:

BTW, I am not defending lawns, since they are nothing like sod. And of course dry grasslands, are well, dry. But not all are, such as the Pampas in S. America, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2016 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Difference views on fetters and kilesas?

Content:

Astus said:

The Mahayana view is that afflictions are enlightenment, simply as they are: empty, ungraspable, and inconceivable.

Malcolm wrote:

Your citations from the MMK don't say that. They merely state that afflictions are not ultimately real.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2016 at 9:24 PM

Title: Re: The case against lawns

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

Here in Nevada hardly anyone has a grass lawn any more. But that is because there is a water shortage here. I don't have grass at any of my properties. We have synthetic grass lawns, shrubs, plants, and fruit trees and of course desert sand and rocks.

Nicholas Weeks said:

Good for you, now get the casinos to cut back on fountains, waterfalls, pools etc.

Also, ban golf courses from using grass, just rocks and sand.

Malcolm wrote:

Golf is the stupidest sport ever, and it is bad for your lower back.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2016 at 8:32 PM

Title: Re: The case against lawns

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

Please provide references, as I did.

Malcolm wrote:

You can just google grassland carbon sequestration. However.

Kim O'Hara said:

One of the reasons for the intensive use of grasslands is the high natural soil fertility. Grasslands characteristically have high inherent soil organic matter content, averaging 333 Mg1 ha-1 (Schlesinger, 1977). Soil organic matter – an important source of plant nutrients – influences the fate of organic residues and inorganic fertilizers, increases soil aggregation, which can limit soil erosion, and also increases cation exchange and water holding capacities (Miller and Donahue, 1990; Kononova, 1966; Allison, 1973; Tate, 1987). It is a key regulator of grassland ecosystem processes. Thus, a prime underlying goal of sustainable management of grassland ecosystems is to maintain high levels of soil organic matter and soil carbon stocks.

Malcolm wrote:

http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/agphome/documents/climate/AGPC_grassland_webversion_19.pdf

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2016 at 8:09 PM

Title: Re: The case against lawns

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

You're right - one-sidedness is not good - but Americans (in particular) are already one-sided with their lawns and need to get rid of some to return to a balance.

You're right - too much human change to the landscape is not good - but the difference between lawn and vegie garden is not as important, to flood control, as the difference between paved surfaces (any kind, including roofs) and growing plants. Anywhere paved, the water just rushes off really quickly. Anywhere with plants, the rain is absorbed like in a sponge and takes a lot longer to move downhill. Forests are best for this but even lawns are better than hard surfaces.

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

Grasslands are better carbon sink than forests, and absorb more water.

Kim O'Hara said:

Hi, Malcolm,

The first half of your comment is not always true according to our (Aussie) Chief Scientist: Based on data from typical perennial grasslands and mature forests in Australia, forests are typically more than 10 times as effective as grasslands at storing carbon on a hectare per hectare basis.

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

In general, it is true. For example, the massive sod buildup in the midwest, before it was all dug up. It averaged 12 feet in depth and more, million of acres.

And it is not simple, "plant things" and heal the planet. One has to plant the right sort of things, and we really do not understand how to "grow a jungle" and create diversity. So, it is better not to destroy habitat in the first place. Conserve, not restore. Why?

Restoration is actually impossible and comes with unintended consequences.

BTW, I am not defending lawns, since they are nothing like sod. And of course dry grasslands, are well, dry. But not all are, such as the Pampas in S. America, etc. That said, I have a lawn, with fruit trees, and a garden we grow every summer. And our

property is ringed by trees and we live in a third growth New England forest. Lots of trees here, more than lawn.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2016 at 8:05 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

We have a saying here which makes the point more strongly:

No matter who you vote for, a politician will be elected.

But I still think we shouldn't give up entirely and opt out of the process. We can still have an effect at times, especially when we band together.

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

Movements are one thing. Parties, another. Political parties tend to become Death Stars.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2016 at 7:19 PM

Title: Re: The case against lawns

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

You're right - one-sidedness is not good - but Americans (in particular) are already one-sided with their lawns and need to get rid of some to return to a balance.

You're right - too much human change to the landscape is not good - but the difference between lawn and vegie garden is not as important, to flood control, as the difference between paved surfaces (any kind, including roofs) and growing plants. Anywhere paved, the water just rushes off really quickly. Anywhere with plants, the rain is absorbed like in a sponge and takes a lot longer to move downhill. Forests are best for this but even lawns are better than hard surfaces.

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

Grasslands are better carbon sink than forests, and absorb more water.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2016 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts

Content:

tomamundsen said:

I saw Lama Tony's post yesterday evening. Does anyone have a link to Jax's original comments?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh yawn, what a bore. Mildly entertaining for thirty seconds.

We cannot control other people's delusion, not matter how much we try. As the saying goes, you can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make it drink.

tomamundsen said:

Well I'm particularly curious about the Longchen Nyingthig controversy. As Lama Tony mentions, we should investigate.

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing to investigate, we all know who Jax is and what his points of view are. It is useless to criticize others, as it just makes one a target of criticism in return. If Duff thinks he is helping anyone, he is mistaken. He is just creating more karma with Jax.

As for the Longchen Nyinthig thing, Jax is just garbling something that ChNN often says: many people think Longchen Nyinthig is all about Dzogchen, but in reality the vast bulk of it is sadhanas. Also, Yeshe Lama is not part of the Longchen Nyinthig, it is not a terma, it is Jigme Lingpa's composition. There are a few very nice Dzogchen texts in the Longchen Nyingthig, but they are very short.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2016 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen & Vipashyana on thoughts

Content:

Garudavista said:

It appears that Jax's mistaken assertions about Dzogchen have caught the eye of Lama Tony Duff (see Lama Tony Duff's Fb Post below), which I am glad to see because I think Lama Tony's constructive criticism of Jax's errors may help some people from getting lost in confusion.

tomamundsen said:

I saw Lama Tony's post yesterday evening. Does anyone have a link to Jax's original comments?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh yawn, what a bore. Mildly entertaining for thirty seconds.

We cannot control other people's delusion, not matter how much we try. As the saying goes, you can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make it drink.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 10th, 2016 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Essence of Conservatism

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

I will happily acknowledge merit where I find it, Nicholas, but that Preface smacks of hagiography. It also - strangely - seems even more old-fashioned than Kirk himself. If you told me the second paragraph had been written in (say) 1910, I wouldn't have any real reason to doubt you.

Kim

Nicholas Weeks said:

How pitiable, a modern conservative Sage finds value and inspiration in old sages.

Unlike we Buddhists, who only admire 21st century sages.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't about that, I am rather fond of sages from Fifth Century BCE -- to the 19th century CE.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 9th, 2016 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: Difference views on fetters and kilesas?

Content:

Saoshun said:

and dzogchen view on them ? if you can explain.

1. Theravada - refraining from fetters and uprooting thru jhana/vipassana meditation and insight.
2. Tantra - transformation?
3. Dzogchen - seeing their true nature (?)

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen view involves seeing the real nature of afflictions is pristine consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 9th, 2016 at 8:30 PM

Title: Re: Difference views on fetters and kilesas?

Content:

Saoshun said:

Examples based on Nagarjuna or how Kilesas are technically related to the tantriks who indulge in them etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Which Nāgārjuna, the one who wrote the MMK? You won't find them. But the one who wrote the Pañcakrama, that is a different story.

The Vajrayāna point of view of the five kleshas is that they are impure form of the five pristine consciousnesses. The so called "tantric" approach is that they are transformed, and when one becomes a strong practitioner, one tests one's practice by engaging in special conduct, which may involve any number of activities normally considered afflictive by those of common Mahāyāna and Hinayāna persuasions. This is why such things are "secret."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 9th, 2016 at 11:23 AM

Title: Re: Gradualism in Dzogchen teachings nowadays ?

Content:

MiphamFan said:

You can do yantra right after receiving DI, or SMS practice's.

Vasana said:

The preliminary exercises and 25 Yantras are taught publicly now, even without D.I.

Realization its self may be non gradual but stabilizing recognition is something that needs ongoing application.

Non-gradual doesn't mean a magic light switch comes on only once and you're completely finished unless you're of the highest capacity of practitioners who has no need to stabilize your initial recognition.

Most of us need to recognize mind essence again and again until it's stable hence these auxiliary practices to help integrate the natural state.

Yantra can be a complete path in and of its self if completely mastered, although the path of means is always to be accompanied by the path of wisdom.

steve_bakr said:

This seems like a wise answer in terms of stabilizing the natural state. A Tantra translated by Wilkonson as "The Tantras of Vajrasattva's Magnificent Sky" demonstrates the non-gradualism of the Great Perfection, and so does that called "The Supreme Source." These two seem to say that the ways of cause and result, of working towards a goal, are not the highest. Some even call meditation a hindrance when it has a goal in mind. They state that the natural state is not to be worked for, because it is already here. But stabilization of this state is very appropriate because there are many distractions.

Malcolm wrote:

Recognition, realization, liberation, this corresponds to the three rigpas: the rigpa of the basis, the rigpa of the path, and the rigpa of the result.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 9th, 2016 at 2:26 AM

Title: Re: Benefits of meditation - scientific evidence

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

it is

it isn't

it is

it isn't

it is

it isn't

it is

it isn't

it is

it isn't

it is

it isn't

it is

it isn't...

boda said:

It isn't

Malcolm wrote:

They fall for it every time...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 9th, 2016 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Queequeg said:

Good point.

The consideration I had, though, was that I'd replace his signs with Green Party signs. Don't know if that would send the same message, though, since most people have no idea that the Green party even exists.

What do you think?

Malcolm wrote:

“At last I have understood that a party is a counterproductive tool, that the given political space is a trap into which life energy disappears, indeed, where it is rededicated to the spiral of death.”

— Rudolf Bharo, Building the Green Movement.

"Is a political party playing by rules set up to favor an industrial capitalist status quo, within what is perhaps misleadingly called “liberal democracy,” not doomed to eventual absorption and neutralization?"

-- David Orton, The Ecocentric Left and Green Electoralism

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 9th, 2016 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Queequeg said:

Until Bernie throws in the towel, the Bernie signs will stay up at my house.

Malcolm wrote:

Keeping it up even after. It's not about parties, it's about people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 8th, 2016 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: Benefits of meditation - scientific evidence

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

it is

it isn't

it is

it isn't

it is

it isn't

it is

it isn't

it is

it isn't

it is

it isn't

it is

it isn't...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 8th, 2016 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Ratnagotravibhāga

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"Dhyani buddha" is not a traditional term, it is a term invented by western scholars. The five buddhas to which you are referring are the respective nirmanakāyas of their buddhafiels, just as Śākyamuni is the buddha of this buddhafielf.

Nicholas Weeks said:

Whether Brian Hodgson 'invented' it or his Newari sage did, it is not such a bad term, since many images of the five are meditating.

<http://www.britannica.com/topic/Dhyani-Buddha>

I started another thread, since we are going off-topic.

Malcolm wrote:

No, in no set of five are they all meditating. Only Amitabha is shown in meditation posture. Generally each of the five has a different gesture, for example, Akshobhya is generally shown touching the ground, Vairocana is shown turning the wheel of Dharma, etc.

The term was invented by non-practitioners who did not understand what they are looking at.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 8th, 2016 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Ratnagotravibhāga

Content:

smcj said:

Yours has a red cover, right? It's different but just as good.

Bakmoon said:

Yup, red cover with a picture of Asanga on the front. Very concise and to the point.

Malcolm wrote:

"Dhyani buddha" is not a traditional term, it is a term invented by western scholars. The five buddhas to which you are referring are the respective nirmanakāyas of their buddhafiels, just as Śākyamuni is the buddha of this buddhafielf.

Bakmoon said:

What is the traditional term? Is it something like the Buddhas of the 5 wisdoms or something?

Malcolm wrote:

Just pañcakula, the five families.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2016 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in This Life

Content:

Harimoo said:

Is there any difference between pre-order on Wisdom Publications and pre-order on Amazon ? (shipments to Europe with Wisdom Pub are huge)

Malcolm wrote:

It is going to be internationally distributed by Simon and Schuster, so you should also be able to get it from Wisdom Books in England.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2016 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: Lists of buddha names in sutras?

Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:

So in sutras, you sometimes encounter lists of Buddhas, such as:

Shorter Amitabha Sutra said:

Shariputra, in the Zenith words there are Buddha Brahmaghosha, Buddha Nakshatraraja, Buddha Gandhottama, Buddha Gandhaprabhasa, Buddha Maharciskandha, Buddha Ratnakusumasampushpitagatra, Buddha Salendraraja, Buddha Ratnotpalashri, Buddha Sarvarthadarsha, Buddha Sumerukalpa, and Buddhas as many as the sands of the River Ganges

Monlam Tharchin said:

I'm not sure what to do with these lists.

Does each Buddha have its own practice/story/visualization that I should become familiar with, or is it sufficient to read the names as I chant the sutra?

Malcolm wrote:

It is sufficient merely to read their names.

Monlam Tharchin said:

Second, is it acceptable to chant the equivalent English translations of the buddha names instead of the Sanskrit?

Is there any reason to chant them in Sanskrit?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Though the Sanskrit is nicer.

Brah-ma-ghosha

Nak-shatra-raja

Gandh-ottama

Gan-dha-pra-bhasa

Mahar-chi-skandha
Ratna-ku-suma-sam-poosh-pita-gatra
Sa-lendra-raja
Rat-not-pala-shri
Sarv-ar-tha-dar-sha
Su-meru-kalpa

Something like this

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2016 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Ratnagotravibhāga

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Thanks for the links crazy, but the question is still unresolved. The Dhyani buddhas like Amita seem to be in a different category than the buddhas in this bhadra kalpa like Shakyamuni.

Malcolm wrote:

"Dhyani buddha" is not a traditional term, it is term invented by western scholars. The five buddhas to which you are referring are the respective nirmanakāyas of their buddhafiels, just as Śākyamuni is the buddha of this buddhafielf.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2016 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in This Life

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This just in, from my facebook feed:

Daniel Aitken from Wisdom Publications here just letting you know that you can now pre-order Malcolm's book at wisdompubs.org/book/buddhahood-life --> Click add to cart --> enter BLPD16 in the discount code box --> then hit recalc order to get a 30% discount. Note: the book went on back order for a couple of days and so sorry for the delay. The book is published in December, but we hope to get it to those who pre-order sometime in November. Thanks everyone and enjoy! For all further questions please email <mailto:community@wisdompubs.org>.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2016 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in This Life

Content:

Kelwin said:

Could you elaborate a bit on it's contents, and/or how it's different from other works on Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Most importantly, it is the precursor to Longchenpa's Tshig don mdzod, and is the text that Longchenpa had in front of him when he wrote the latter. Longchenpa lifts entire passages from this text. Secondly, it contains, I believe, the first translation of an extensive analysis of the opening scenes of the Dzogchen tantras, the nidāna section. Third, it is a quarter of the length of the Tshig don mdzod, making it a more manageable text, since it has many less citations. It gives context to Longchenpa's own works and thought on Dzogchen man ngag sde. It is a major text of the Northern Treasures tradition. Finally, it has my introduction where I detail my thoughts on Dzogchen terminology and view.

M

Kelwin said:

Thank you, order coming up!

Malcolm wrote:

I hope you enjoy it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2016 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in This Life

Content:

Saoshun said:

Is this book any practical like Sublime Dharma type instructions or nang jang?

Malcolm wrote:

This book is a comprehensive overview of the approach of Dzogchen man ngag sde. It is not a visionary account, like Dudjom Lingpa's Nangjang.

Kelwin said:

Could you elaborate a bit on it's contents, and/or how it's different from other works on Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Most importantly, it is the precursor to Longchenpa's Tshig don mdzod, and is the text that Longchenpa had in front of him when he wrote the latter. Longchenpa lifts entire passages from this text. Secondly, it contains, I believe, the first translation of an extensive analysis of the opening scenes of the Dzogchen tantras, the nidāna section. Third, it is a quarter of the length of the Tshig don mdzod, making it a more manageable text, since it has many less citations. It gives context to Longchenpa's own works and thought on Dzogchen man ngag sde. It is a major text of the Northern Treasures tradition.

Finally, it has my introduction where I detail my thoughts on Dzogchen terminology and view.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2016 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: The Treasury of Basic Space of Phenomena

Content:

smcj said:

How does...

...suggest that mountains disappear when you stop looking at them? Or, for that matter, how does the mirror metaphor suggest that either?

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, find a Dzogchen master and stop trying to interpret this teaching based on translations for texts you have never been taught.

But just a head's up:

Empty vidyā, the dharmakāya beyond thought, is very different from space, an inert void.

The major and minor marks of the sambhogakāya of vidyā are very different from the sun and moon's inert light.

The emanations of vidyā that performs deeds that benefit others is very different than the inert emanation of the four continents.

-- The Tantra of the Sun Blazing in the Clear Sky Tantra

smcj said:

Sorry, but I really don't see how your last two posts relate to mine at all, minus the dismissive part. They read like non-sequiturs. Given this is an internet forum and that you're a really bright guy, your posts should make sense. If anything your quotation of that tantra just restates the same point that Tulku Urgyen Rinpoche made.

Malcolm wrote:

I was answering a question which you edited out of your post concerning whether or not this meant that rigpa was everything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2016 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: The Treasury of Basic Space of Phenomena

Content:

smcj said:

No, since Longchenpa also ridicules the idea of mountains disappearing if we cease

looking at them.

How does... In the ultimate sense, space and awareness are a unity.

...suggest that mountains disappear when you stop looking at them? Or, for that matter, how does the mirror metaphor suggest that either?

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, find a Dzogchen master and stop trying to interpret this teaching based on translations for texts you have never been taught.

But just a head's up:

Empty vidyā, the dharmakāya beyond thought,
is very different from space, an inert void.

The major and minor marks of the sambhogakāya of vidyā
are very different from the sun and moon's inert light.

The emanations of vidyā that performs deeds that benefit others
is very different than the inert emanation of the four continents.

-- The Tantra of the Sun Blazing in the Clear Sky Tantra

From a karmic point of view, Dzogchen makes a hard distinction between inert and sentient phenomena, even if that distinction vanishes in realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2016 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: The Treasury of Basic Space of Phenomena

Content:

smcj said:

In the ultimate sense, space and awareness are a unity.

That is beautiful! I love how he brings space and awareness together as a unity. What really answered my question is when he said that space is always accompanied by wakefulness.

Pretty trippy. Reminds me of the mirror metaphor.

Malcolm wrote:

No, since Longchenpa also ridicules the idea of mountains disappearing if we cease looking at them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2016 at 2:46 AM

Title: Re: Is it attachment to tell someone you like them?

Content:

MiphamFan said:

If I like someone and tell them, in hopes of starting a relationship, is it attachment and hence the cause for being reborn as a preta?

How do I go beyond hope and fear in this situation?

If I tell them, then I am hoping for a relationship.

If I avoid, I am either fearing rejection or rebirth as a preta.

Just tell them without any expectation?

Malcolm wrote:

If you become a stalker, maybe. But otherwise, why would it be?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, June 7th, 2016 at 2:24 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Buddha was a therapist...

Malcolm wrote:

You'll fit right in with the Secular Buddhist crowd, Dante.

gad rgyangs said:

"So, Māluṅkyaputta, remember what is undeclared by me as undeclared, and what is declared by me as declared.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, Buddha would think this whole conversation was stupid and off topic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Buddha was a therapist...

Malcolm wrote:

You'll fit right in with the Secular Buddhist crowd, Dante.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Iconodule said:

I think people living at the time of the Buddha could have quite easily seen that the Mt Meru cosmology did not match up exactly with the bare observable facts, but they

retained it regardless.

Malcolm wrote:

Something like the TO world maps...

Iconodule said:

Sure. And for one thing, a 100-mile high tree at the center of the continent should have been readily observable. Taken in a bare empirical sense, it seems to me the jambudvipa cosmology would be almost immediately falsifiable, which raises questions about how it really should be taken.

Malcolm wrote:

As a moral and aesthetic cosmology, not literally. For example, Edward Henning, probably the world's leading expert on Kalachakra calculations right now, points out in his lengthy technical book, Kalachakra and the Tibetan Calendar, that the authors of the Kalachakra certainly did not take the Meru cosmology literally because the calculations it offers for calendar making won't work in a Meru Cosmology, though they do work fine in a terra-centric model, just like Ptolemaic astrology (upon which all Indian astrological systems are based).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Iconodule said:

I think people living at the time of the Buddha could have quite easily seen that the Mt Meru cosmology did not match up exactly with the bare observable facts, but they retained it regardless.

Malcolm wrote:

Something like the TO world maps...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

aussiebloke said:

Malcolm where do you get the information that Milarepa had ten dzogchen teachers?

Malcolm wrote:

Ten Nyingma masters, not ten Dzogchen teachers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 9:15 PM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

tiagolps said:

Stephen Batchelor runs a therapy show.

Malcolm wrote:

I saw him once, about eight months ago, it was pretty boring and predictable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 7:21 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

We all live on Jambudipa, it's not just India.

Malcolm wrote:

It's is just India.

maybay said:

Where do we live?

Malcolm wrote:

Turtle Island.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 7:11 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Quite obviously Jambudipa cannot be planet Earth...

Malcolm wrote:

Of course not, since it is India.

Tsongkhapafan said:

We all live on Jambudipa, it's not just India.

Malcolm wrote:

It's is just India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 7:09 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Quay said:

[

But if you're saying that in a conventional sense the earth appears to be generally like it was then (in relation to the average human lifespan over the last twenty centuries) but the way of looking at it has generally changed then that makes sense to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 7:06 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

[

Buddha had a more limited understanding....

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say that. I said that Indians during the time of the Buddha had a more limited understanding. But would your faith in Dharma really come crashing down if Buddha was not knowledgeable in atomic physics?

Tsongkhapafan said:

All biographies of Nagarjuna explain that he went to the Northern Continent (sorry, my mistake). What evidence do you have that these are tall tales? Because you don't agree? Nagarjuna wrote about Mount Meru in his works such as Friendly Letter - was he wrong, confused or of a more limited understanding? This is a very ordinary view.

Malcolm wrote:

The biographies of Nāgārjuna are fanciful hagiographies (and you are only referring to Tibetan hagiographies, to the exclusion of earlier Chinese ones) written many centuries after his death. They are statements of faith, not statements of fact. In fact we know very little about Nāgārjuna as a person. Traditional sources frequently conflate Nāgārjuna of the MMK with later persons of the same name. But really, we don't need to know much about Nāgārjuna of the MMK as a person. His enduring legacy is found in the collection of reasoning and the collection of praises (excluding the Dharmadhātustava, which is clearly much later).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Virgo said:

Are you saying that beings on earth at that time perceived Mt. Meru (and that is why it was described), or are you saying that Enlightened Beings simply perceive geography differently than we do?

Kevin

Tsongkhapafan said:

Quite obviously Jambudipa cannot be planet Earth...

Malcolm wrote:

Of course not, since it is India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 6:22 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

That's because you are literalist (despite your protestations) and cannot understand how two completely different realities can exist and that Buddha and other Indian scholars were not describing the world that appears karmically to our minds today.

Malcolm wrote:

They experienced the same world we do today. They just had a more limited understanding of it since they travelled less, had less scientific instruments for measurement, less reliable means of recording things they discovered, and so on.

Tsongkhapafan said:

No doubt you revere Nagarjuna from the point of view of his teaching of the Middle Way yet you cannot accept that he saw Mount Meru and went to the Western continent, even though this is the consequence of his teaching!

Malcolm wrote:

I have read every text written by Nāgārjuna, and there is not a single one where he reports either seeing Meru or travelling Aparagodaniya. These are tall tales without shred of truth in them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 6:09 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Yes Meru exists.

No Meru does not exist.

Meru exists at a conventional level but not an absolute level.

Who's going to use the fourth option?

Malcolm wrote:

What I really want to know is why Buddha, Nāgārjuna and Vasubandhu never mentioned anywhere the continents now known as North and South America. It is not like the magically popped into existence when they were "discovered" by Colombus.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Quite simply because those things didn't exist for them. They exist only for us who have more degenerate minds and impure karma.

Malcolm wrote:

Really, so all those human beings who lived in the Mayan empire 2000 years ago just popped into being one day? Are you daft? Dinosaurs did not exist because they were not relevant to the Buddha?

I think you better revisit what "conventional" means.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 6:07 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Did they mention Australia anywhere?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 6:07 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Errr, we are talking about the omniscient Buddha here aren't we? Buddha explained the

universe in different ways in accordance with the karma of the beings who experienced it because it appeared differently to them.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha explained things to people in a way which corresponded with their inclinations. He was not running a class in advanced cosmology.

Tsongkhapa said:

I'm surprised you take such a literal view about these things.

Malcolm wrote:

The one here taking a literalist view is you.

Tsongkhapa said:

Surely someone who understands emptiness also understands that there are as many worlds and as many universes as there are living beings because everyone has individual karma and there is no inherently existent world? It's completely subjective and therefore for those who have the karma to validly perceive Mount Meru, Mount Meru exists.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course I accept that there are many worlds and universes, all formed out of the karma of sentient beings.

What I do not accept is that medieval Indian representations of Terra Firma ever depicted our own planet with as much accuracy as we have today.

There are so many inconsistencies: for example, the sun rises because it comes from behind Meru, and the moon sets because it moves behind Meru. But the reality is that even Indian astronomical math, concurrent with Vasubandhu, for example, excludes the possibility of Mt. Meru, which is why Hindus commonly located Meru at the poles (of course they never visited the poles, so they were speculating).

So just accept Meru cosmology for what it is a) an inaccurate representation of our world, an axial cosmology meant to describe the relative location of beings above and below the plane of the ground, according to their merit and leave it at that. Meru Cosmology cannot be taken literally, or conventionally. It is at best a moral metaphor.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 5:55 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Of course you realise that, according to your logic, it is just as incorrect to say it does exist. In which case: back to square 1.

Tsongkhapafan said:

That doesn't make any sense. Since great beings with greater insight and keener minds have described the universe according to the Mount Meru model, it definitely does exist for some.

Sherab Dorje said:

Yes Meru exists.

No Meru does not exist.

Meru exists at a conventional level but not an absolute level.

Who's going to use the fourth option?

Malcolm wrote:

What I really want to know is why Buddha, Nāgārjuna and Vasubandhu never mentioned anywhere the continents now known as North and South America. It is not like the magically popped into existence when they were "discovered" by Colombus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Since everything is mere karmic appearance, and there are different appearances for different minds, it is incorrect to say that Mount Meru does not exist.

Sherab Dorje said:

Of course you realise that, according to your logic, it is just as incorrect to say it does exist. In which case: back to square 1.

Tsongkhapafan said:

That doesn't make any sense. Since great beings with greater insight and keener minds have described the universe according to the Mount Meru model, it definitely does exist for some.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it can be explained just as easily that they were explaining things in accordance with what people at that time thought was true, in accordance with the conventions of the day, and were they explaining the same things today, they would explain the universe according to the model presented to us by modern astronomy and geography. Yes conventions change, but we rarely trade in our new conventions for old ones.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 5:35 AM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:
BuddhaFollower said:
So what is the best way to support Meru cosmology?

Point out that Tertons use Meru cosmology to navigate the Pure Lands?

P.S. Yes I know Pure Lands is not the accurate translation.

Malcolm wrote:
Why should we bother? Meru Cosmology is useful for mandala offerings, but it is an ancient interpretation of our world, and it does not need to be the same world that actually formed out of the karma of ordinary sentient beings.

The material of the Meru Cosmology which we offer in mandala offerings is something that we imagine is formed out of our body, enjoyments and the merit we have accumulated throughout the three times, its essence being inseparable bliss and emptiness.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 5:23 AM
Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism
Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:
Yes, but the appearance of pus and blood is valid for a hungry ghost, and water is a valid cognition for a human.

Malcolm wrote:
The preta's vision of pus and blood is not valid for humans.

Tsongkhapafan said:
It would be wrong to say that there are beings who do not experience liquid as pus and blood. In the same way, it would be wrong to say that there are no beings who experience Mount Meru.

Malcolm wrote:
False equivalence. We are talking about the common conventional perceptions of humans in this dimension. We are not discussing intra-dimensional perceptions. The world the Buddha and Nāgārjuna were discussing was this human realm.

Tsongkhapafan said:
Buddha talked about it, as did Nagarjuna (who went to the Western continent) and other great Buddhist masters. We cannot say that the appearance of a planet earth is the only valid appearance.

Malcolm wrote:

It is quite possible Nāgārjuna went to Africa (the western continent), though unlikely, given that he lived in South-East India, in the Andhra region. The basis for the Meru cosmology is this planet, merely represented inaccurately in the imagination of some medieval Indians who did not have as accurate a geographical understanding of this world as we do today.

For example, both Ptolemy and Vasubandhu talk about the Kurus (Scythians), but by Vasubandhu's time (a good 6 centuries after Ptolemy's time, long after the Scythians had vanished as a people), the account of the Central Asian steppes and their peoples were so garbled in the imagination of some Indians, they wrote down all kinds of fabulous exaggerations about the Earth that we see in chapter three of the Kosha.

For example, many people make the mistake of thinking that Jambudvīpa is the whole planet earth, when its descriptions clearly indicate that it is only a description of the subcontinent of India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in This Life

Content:

steve_bakr said:

I pre-ordered the Kindle version.

Malcolm wrote:

Thanks!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: The Treasury of Basic Space of Phenomena

Content:

steve_bakr said:

I have read this work by Longchenpa several times and would appreciate impressions and commentaries of others here. It seems to go beyond traditional concepts and boundaries. I would also appreciate your thoughts on the "space of Phenomena."

Malcolm wrote:

It is meant to support the practice of trekchö.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, June 6th, 2016 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Community of Chogyal Namkhai Norbu

Content:

Pema Yolo said:

What is going on here? Everyone just listens to music together for a while?

Malcolm wrote:

NO, first there is generally singing, then there is dancing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2016 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

madhusudan said:

I'm looking for recommendations of texts that explain the error in scientific materialism and/or positivism. I have Thinley Norbu's Cascading Waterfall of Nectar, which has some good refutations of both eternalism and nihilism. What medicine do you recommend?

Malcolm wrote:

His refutation of modern geography and defense of Meru Cosmology is pretty lame, quite frankly.

Tsongkhapa said:

Since Mount Meru is a mere appearance to mind in accordance with a person's karma (as is everything) and doesn't exist outside the mind, how can Mount Meru be refuted?

Malcolm wrote:

Just as the karmic appearance of pus and blood to a preta is a false perception of water for a human, likewise, the imputation of Mt. Meru cosmology is a false imputation from the perspective of what is commonly accepted conventionally among most modern humans living today.

That said, I have always maintained that Meru Cosmology has a basis in our world, but that it is Indo-centric perspective of the world, no more nor less exaggerated than medieval European visions of the world, with all their inaccuracies and "Here be monsters..."

Anyway, it is pretty clear that Meru Cosmology is a descendent of Babylonian cosmology, shifted to India.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Babylonian_Map_of_the_World

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2016 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

madhusudan said:

I'm looking for recommendations of texts that explain the error in scientific materialism and/or positivism. I have Thinley Norbu's Cascading Waterfall of Nectar, which has some good refutations of both eternalism and nihilism. What medicine do you recommend?

Malcolm wrote:

His refutation of modern geography and defense of Meru Cosmology is pretty lame, quite frankly.

Manjushri Fan said:

Hi Malcolm, I don't have the text but I don't suppose you can give a brief rundown of his refutation.

Malcolm wrote:

He gives a classic argument from authority. 1) It says so in Abhidharmakośa, 2) it is based on wisdom, and therefore we are fools to reject it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2016 at 8:50 PM

Title: Re: Texts that destroy ""scientific" materialism

Content:

madhusudan said:

I'm looking for recommendations of texts that explain the error in scientific materialism and/or positivism. I have Thinley Norbu's Cascading Waterfall of Nectar, which has some good refutations of both eternalism and nihilism. What medicine do you recommend?

Malcolm wrote:

His refutation of modern geography and defense of Meru Cosmology is pretty lame, quite frankly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2016 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Sangha in the west

Content:

Nyedrag Yeshe said:

What are your opinions about how the term and the idea of 'Sangha' changed and was corrupted in the west?

Malcolm wrote:

It has not changed, nor has it been corrupted.

Nyedrag Yeshe said:

Please, explain why not Namdrol la!

Malcolm wrote:

One, the Sangha is all people who have taken refuge, not just "ordained" people. This is made extremely clear by Gorampa Sonam Senge, among others.

The refuge of the Sangha has two aspects: the Aryā Sangha, the actual Sangha of refuge, and then there are our teachers and companions on the path. And for Mahāyanists, the Ārya Sangha of Refuge is only bodhisattvas, not even arhats and so on.

In Tibet, monasteries are the source of community life. People go to them for education, medical care, advice, rituals, help with mundane matters as well as spiritual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2016 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Sangha in the west

Content:

Nyedrag Yeshe said:

What are your opinions about how the term and the idea of 'Sangha' changed and was corrupted in the west?

Malcolm wrote:

It has not changed, nor has it been corrupted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2016 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

well of course, but on some readings they are only negated for "beings" with svabhava, and still apply to conventional phenomena. But its pretty incoherent: if you assert non-arising, then how are you supposed to get dependent arising?

Malcolm wrote:

At this point, who cares? Kind of tired of this conversation. Madhyamaka 101.

gad rgyangs said:

cop out

Malcolm wrote:
No, boredom.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2016 at 1:47 AM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2
Content:
kirtu said:
Come on - people born and raised in the US have always had a tendency toward violence. America is an angry, violent place and this is nothing new in itself.

Malcolm wrote:
Right, because people born in Europe are so peace-loving and calm....

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2016 at 1:42 AM
Title: Re: Sangha in the west
Content:
Nyedrag Yeshe said:
he justifies some of my opinions.

Malcolm wrote:
Isn't it great when our opinions are justified?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2016 at 1:13 AM
Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
If you see a seed planted in the ground and then you see a sprout grow from it, how do you explain this?

Malcolm wrote:
Through the six causes and four conditions. But these are negated in the very first chapter of the MMK.

gad rgyangs said:
well of course, but on some readings they are only negated for "beings" with svabhava, and still apply to conventional phenomena. But its pretty incoherent: if you assert non-arising, then how are you supposed to get dependent arising?

Malcolm wrote:

At this point, who cares? Kind of tired of this conversation. Madhyamaka 101.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2016 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Dependent arising...[is]...not really an attempt to understand or describe the world.

Malcolm wrote:

So again, you are disagreeing above only to agree here. I said above:

Nope. It [dependent origination] was not intended to describe external physical processes at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, June 5th, 2016 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

If you see a seed planted in the ground and then you see a sprout grow from it, how do you explain this?

Malcolm wrote:

Through the six causes and four conditions. But these are negated in the very first chapter of the MMK.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2016 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: kriya yoga

Content:

HandsomeMonkeyking said:

A long time ago I read 'Autobiography of a Yogi' by Paramahansa Yogananda, in there is 'Kriya Yoga' mentioned.

Now reading 'The Lotus Born' I also came about this term. I wonder if they are the same are are related in any way. If there is any traceback/connection.

If I remember correctly Yogananda was Hindu.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the terms have no relation to one another. Kriya Yoga tantra is the lowest of the six or

four divisions of tantra, concerning itself with ritual purity and ritual details.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2016 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

is dependent arising an archaic theory of physics that has been replaced by more current theories like quantum physics and relativity?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. It was not intended to describe external physical processes at all. But that is off top for this thread.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2016 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ummmm...Nāgārjuna held the metaphysical view that sentient beings take rebirth, that past actions ripen, that merit must be accumulated in order to earn the marks of a buddha, etc. So obviously this is not the case.

gad rgyangs said:

all this concerns conventional reality and therefore is not metaphysical, and is illusory as well.

Malcolm wrote:

hahahahaha, now that is some eel-wriggling. What it proves in the end, after all this bullshit, is that you agree with me that the "views" that Nāgārjuna was concerned to remove are solely views concerning existence and nonexistence. Case closed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2016 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in This Life

Content:

Saoshun said:

Is this book any practical like Sublime Dharma type instructions or nang jang?

Malcolm wrote:

This book is a comprehensive overview of the approach of Dzogchen man ngag sde. It is not a visionary account, like Dudjom Lingpa's Nangjang.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2016 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

you are completely misunderstanding the story that Chanra quotes: the whole point is views can be antidotal, but after they have done their antidoting, they must be eliminated or they will themselves become poisons.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I understand the point. But your insistence that we must not views at all for any reason is too extreme.

gad rgyangs said:

see my comment above about dependent arising: it is only metaphysical views that must be abandoned. Physical views can be taken or left as convenient.

Malcolm wrote:

Ummmm...Nāgārjuna held the metaphysical view that sentient beings take rebirth, that past actions ripen, that merit must be accumulated in order to earn the marks of a buddha, etc. So obviously this is not the case.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2016 at 11:42 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

that's why, when commenting on 13.8, Chandra quotes this passage from the Kāśyapaparivata Sūtra:

Malcolm wrote:

You are confusing emptiness with dependent origination. Emptiness is a negation, but dependent origination is a statement on how conditioned things function, i.e things do not arise from themselves, from other, from both or without a cause.

You are also making the mistaken argument that views cannot be antidotal, that they are invariably pathological. Thus, Candrakīrti states that right view, emptiness, is the antidote for wrong views.

I think you are getting a little too carried away with your anti-view view.

gad rgyangs said:

you are completely misunderstanding the story that Chanra quotes: the whole point is views can be antidotal, but after they have done their antidoting, they must be eliminated or they will themselves become poisons.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I understand the point. But your insistence that we must not views at all for any reason is too extreme.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2016 at 11:15 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

that's why, when commenting on 13.8, Chandra quotes this passage from the Kāśyapaparivata Sūtra:

It is as if, Kāśyapa, there were a sick person, and a doctor were to give that person a physic, and that physic having gone to the gut, having eliminated all the person's bad humors, was not itself expelled. What do you think, Kāśyapa, would that person be free of disease?

No, lord, the illness of the person would be more intense if the physic eliminated all the bad humors but was not expelled from the gut.

Malcolm wrote:

You are confusing emptiness with dependent origination. Emptiness is a negation, but dependent origination is a statement on how conditioned things function, i.e things do not arise from themselves, from other, from both or without a cause.

You are also making the mistaken argument that views cannot be antidotal, that they are invariably pathological. Thus, Candrakīrti states that right view, emptiness, is the antidote for wrong views.

I think you are getting a little too carried away with your anti-view view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2016 at 10:59 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But it clearly is a view: "Where this arises, that arose; with the arising that, this arose; where cease ceases, that ceases; with the cessation of that, this ceases."

How does dependent origination function? It functions because entities are empty of existence and nonexistence. That emptiness is what is not to be taken as a view. But dependent origination is acceptable as a view. Why? This is the question you need to

ask yourself. If Buddha taught no views at all, then there is no need for Dharma, a path, nor could there be a result.

gad rgyangs said:

Dependent origination we declare to be emptiness.

It is a dependent concept; just that is the middle path.

24.18

Emptiness is taught by the conquerors as the expedient to get rid of all views.

But those for whom emptiness is a view have been called incurable.

13.8

He taught therapies, not views.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha did not teach emptiness as a view, indeed, but he certainly taught dependent origination as a view. In fact it is what is called "right view."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2016 at 9:37 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are only two of those views, i.e., "It exists" and "It does not exist." Nāgārjuna negates these two because he has a view — dependent origination, which he calls the "the pacification of views."

gad rgyangs said:

which must not itself be taken as a view.

Malcolm wrote:

But it clearly is a view: "Where this arises, that arose; with the arising that, this arose; where cease ceases, that ceases; with the cessation of that, this ceases."

How does dependent origination function? It functions because entities are empty of existence and nonexistence. That emptiness is what is not to be taken as a view. But dependent origination is acceptable as a view. Why? This is the question you need to ask yourself. If Buddha taught no views at all, then there is no need for Dharma, a path, nor could there be a result.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2016 at 9:18 AM

Title: Re: Karma Nyingtik

Content:

MiphamFan said:

What about the bram ze'i skor of Zhangton Chobar, the Lamdre lineage head? Is there any mention of its origins?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes it is the terma of Drom Yeshé Nyingpo, who likely lived in the mid-tenth and early eleventh centuries, making him earlier than Sangye Lama.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2016 at 9:14 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As long as we understand, as I pointed out at the very beginning here, that "all views" simply means views of existence and nonexistence.

gad rgyangs said:

any views that attempt to objectively characterize the "non-enumerated ultimate truth, which is inexpressible".

Malcolm wrote:

There are only two of those views, i.e., "It exists" and "It does not exist." Nāgārjuna negates these two because he has a view — dependent origination, which he calls the "the pacification of views."

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.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think so. That is not the intent of the statement.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2016 at 6:55 AM

Title: Re: Karma Nyingtik

Content:

heart said:

Thank you, I do appreciate the quotes. For me it is obvious that there was a lineage of Dzogchen Nyingtik before Zhangton and that he was a lineage holder. Isn't it possible

that some of the Vima Nyingtik is more kama than terma?

Malcolm wrote:

Zhangton makes it very clear that prior to him the utterly secret cycle was not promulgated prior to his revelation. By this I understand his termas specifically to be the Golden Letters, Copper Letters, Agate Letters, Conch letters and Turquoise letters cycles, based on the index to the collection.

However, there are some texts which may have been bundled together with his termas, such as the four empowerments authored by Chetsun Senge Wangchuk, the Seventy-Four Fragments (which are a terma attributed to Chetsun), the Soaring Garuda of Śrī Simha, the so called Sems dmigs drug of Vimalamitra, The Seven-fold Trekchö, and so on which are included. However, some of these aforementioned texts are also found separately from the Volumes of the Vima Nyinthig. Thus, strictly speaking, for various reasons I consider the Vima Snyinthig to be comprised of the Golden Letters, Copper Letters, Agate Letters, Conch letters and Turquoise letters cycles, and therefore the termas of Zhangton.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2016 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are two kinds of ultimate truths. Nominal 'emptiness' is a nominal ultimate truth, which refers to the absence of extremes in all phenomena, hence, 'emptiness' is in fact a conventional view. Nominal "emptiness" is not the non-enumerated ultimate truth, which is inexpressible.

gad rgyangs said:

and that is why N concluded his work by saying that the Buddha taught the Dharma for the abandonment of all views: not until all views (including emptiness) are abandoned, can one hope to glimpse the "inexpressible ultimate truth".

Malcolm wrote:

As long as we understand, as I pointed out at the very beginning here, that "all views" simply means views of existence and nonexistence.

Is it possible to express anything concerning this truth? Perhaps this:

"There is no distinction whatsoever between saṃsāra and nirvāṇa.

There is no distinction whatsoever between nirvāṇa and saṃsāra."

MMK 25.19

Or perhaps more apt:

This pair, samsara and nirvana, do not exist.

However thorough knowledge of samsara is nirvana.

But of course, all of this concerns the objective state of phenomena, and not how we

subjectively experience the path and its realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, June 4th, 2016 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Karma Nyingtik

Content:

heart said:

But it certainly seems he also received something from Chetsun, you have any idea what?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the account states he had a visionary meeting with Chetsun, but this was long after Chetsun attained rainbow body.

heart said:

Yes maybe, but for him to know about Chetsun he must have been known by him somehow or are you suggesting that he invented Chetsun?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Chetsun was the teacher of Chegom Nagpo. Chegom Nagpo was the teacher of Zhangton. Zhangton spent one year with Chegom when he was eleven. His bio says: ...when he arrived, he met Guru Chegom Nagpo, Having pleased the guru, the latter said "Since this one is the arrival of an emanation of a buddha, you should give this one to me" and Tashi Dorje remained in his presence for one year.

As Zhangton says:

As such, thirty years later, having gone to the place where Chetsun disappeared, Chegom Nagpo of mNar mDa' in Rong took out the outer, inner and secret oral lineage and the instruction was not promulgated to others apart from himself. These then spread widely in dBus and gTsang. Fifty years after the revelation by Chegom Nagpo, I [Tashi Dorje] removed these unsurpassed secret cycles and the instruction was not promulgated to others apart from myself.

After he left Chegom, he studied with 13 masters, and learned all Dharma topics, including secret mantra.

Zhangton Tashi Dorje was 18 when he revealed the Vima Nyinthig — this was eighty years after Chetsun took rainbow body. However, in Zhang's bio, after he revealed the Vima Nyinthig, it says:

Then, when he returned to gTsang, because he went up from Shangs and rTa nag, after

he met with the siddha Senge Wangchuk on a bridge, he [Tashi Dorje] confirmed the ultimate three kāyas were inseparable, and having granted permission for the Dharma, [Senge Wangchuk] left and disappeared.

So basically, Zhangton received an entrustment of the teachings from Chetsun Senge Wangchuk in a vision. But they never met as two physical human beings. The relative connection between them was Chegom Nagpo.

BTW, these texts are directly from the Vima Nyinthig. This information was going to be part of my intro, but it was becoming too long. I have a book of Vima Nyinthig material, I will probably include it there. The later bios that state that Chetsun was the guru of Zhangton are not very precise. But the autobiography and the bios in the Vima Nyinthik itself are very precise and explain the situation very thoroughly. Not only did Zhangton have a visionary encounter with Chetsun Senge Wangchuk, he later had a visionary encounter with Vimalamitra:

After that, at one time when he [Tashi Dorje] was invited to mTshur khungs by Loppon Nyergom. In the pre-dawn, when doing a ganacakra, he met Vimala, was blessed and granted permissions. [Vimala] left into the sky and disappeared. At that time Tashi Dorje was sixty-one years of age.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

So either there is more to "views to be abandoned" than just existence and non-existence, or emptiness must be a view of either existence or non-existence. Take your pick.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two kinds of ultimate truths. Nominal 'emptiness' is a nominal ultimate truth, which refers to the absence of extremes in all phenomena, hence, 'emptiness' is in fact a conventional view. Nominal "emptiness" is not the non-enumerated ultimate truth, which is inexpressible.

gad rgyangs said:

where does Nagarjuna say that there are "two kinds of ultimate truths"?

Malcolm wrote:

It is strongly implied by these two passages:

Those who do not know the
the division of the two truths,
do not know the profound principle of
the Buddha's teaching.

Without depending on convention,
one cannot explain the ultimate meaning.

Without realizing the ultimate meaning,
nirvana cannot be attained.

In the second passage above, the first two lines explain the nominal ultimate; the second two lines explain the ultimate of realization.

In the next passage he warns against leaving the explanation of the ultimate truth (emptiness) as an intellectual theory:
When emptiness is seen incorrectly,
those of little wisdom are destroyed,
like one who handles a snake incorrectly,
or practices a vidyāmantra incorrectly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

So either there is more to "views to be abandoned" than just existence and non-existence, or emptiness must be a view of either existence or non-existence. Take your pick.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two kinds of ultimate truths. Nominal 'emptiness' is a nominal ultimate truth, which refers to the absence of extremes in all phenomena, hence, 'emptiness' is in fact a conventional view. Nominal "emptiness" is not the non-enumerated ultimate truth, which is inexpressible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in This Life

Content:

paël said:

Can anyone read this book?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a restricted publication, that said, you should try to gain dzogchen transmission and teachings. The book is meant for practitioners, like all such books.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Karma Nyingtik

Content:

heart said:

Ok, I can see the logic in that. I assume Tashi Dorje above is Zhangton, or is it Chetsun?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Tashi Dorje is Zhangton.

M

heart said:
But it certainly seems he also received something from Chetsun, you have any idea what?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Well, the account states he had a visionary meeting with Chetsun, but this was long after Chetsun attained rainbow body.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 7:59 AM
Title: Re: Seventh Root Downfall, Academia, Public Life
Content:
fckw said:
You might be wrong. Either about "vast majority" or about "public" and "openly accessible".

Malcolm wrote:
Well, the only think holding you back from reading the vast majority of "secret" Tibetan texts available to the Tibetan speaking public is knowledge of Tibetan.

fckw said:
So, in other words, these texts are "widely available" to a few scholars knowledgeable both in Sanskrit and old Tibetan dialects but not the average practitioner.

Malcolm wrote:
You seem to be forgetting all those Tibetans that actually speak Tibetan...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 7:16 AM
Title: Re: Germany is Germany!
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
The climate change thing is an important factor: long term drought in Syria causes food shortages, which led to riots, etc...

Sherab Dorje said:
Source please...

Malcolm wrote:
Drought:
<http://www.pnas.org/content/112/11/3241>

Food:
<http://phys.org/news/2015-10-role-food-prices-syrian-crisis.html>

Riots:

<http://motherboard.vice.com/read/commodities-traders-helped-spark-the-war-in-syria-complex-systems-theorists-say>

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 4:51 AM
Title: Re: Niece of Khenpo Jigme Phuntsok
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Ani Muntso, an emanation of Yeshe Tsogyal
[muntso.jpg \(28.54 KiB\)](#) Viewed 1673 times

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 4:29 AM
Title: Re: Germany is Germany!
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
Yeah the climate change explanation I've read for the Syrian conflict is pretty far fetched...especially when there's the glaringly obvious US foreign policy decisions that come into play.

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/nov/29/climate-change-syria-civil-war-prince-charles>

Malcolm wrote:
The climate change thing is an important factor: long term drought in Syria causes food shortages, which led to riots, etc...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 4:08 AM
Title: Re: Karma Nyingtik

Content:
heart said:

Ok, I can see the logic in that. I assume Tashi Dorje above is Zhangton, or is it Chetsun?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Tashi Dorje is Zhangton.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 3:49 AM
Title: Re: Buddhahood in This Life
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Maybe you can pass as a Syrian Refugee...

Sherab Dorje said:
Three months ago I could have. Nowadays it is an easy way to get yourself shot.

Malcolm wrote:
Just kidding around, but it is worth it to get there somehow...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 3:41 AM
Title: Re: Buddhahood in This Life
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
I strongly encourage anyone in Europe to make a connection with Tulku Dakpa. He lives in Finland and he is really an awesome guy. He is beginning a five year series on Longchenpa's Great Chariot in Finland in July.

Sherab Dorje said:
Sounds great. Unfortunately for me Finland is 2600 kilometers away (1588 miles) and REALLY expensive (especially for an under/un-employed Greek).

Malcolm wrote:
Maybe you can pass as a Syrian Refugee...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 3:30 AM
Title: Re: Buddhahood in This Life
Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

A bnargain! Now all we need is for Malcolm to give us the lung and we're set!

Malcolm wrote:

You can ask Tulku Dagpa for the Lung, or any Lama who was present for the Gongpa Zangthal teachings in Poland, Virginia, or LA. Their pronunciation will be much better than mine.

M

Sherab Dorje said:

Yeah, like the accent will make a difference to me!

Malcolm wrote:

I strongly encourage anyone in Europe to make a connection with Tulku Dakpa. He lives in Finland and he is really an awesome guy. He is beginning a five year series on Longchenpa's Great Chariot in Finland in July.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: Ngakpa/Ngakma Teachers?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

OG = Original Guru?

Malcolm wrote:

Original Gangster, respect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in This Life

Content:

tomamundsen said:

It comes out to \$20.97 after the discount. I found out because I forgot to apply my discount code and then emailed the publisher directly.

Sherab Dorje said:

A bnargain! Now all we need is for Malcolm to give us the lung and we're set!

Malcolm wrote:

You can ask Tulku Dagpa for the Lung, or any Lama who was present for the Gongpa Zangthal teachings in Poland, Virginia, or LA. Their pronunciation will be much better than mine.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: Buddhahood in This Life

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Is there somewhere I can download a pirated copy of it?

Malcolm wrote:

Undoubtedly, there will be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: Karma Nyingtik

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

the Vima Nyingthig is never considered terma, though it is in fact.

heart said:

What is the fact that makes it a terma?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there is the fact that Zhangton says so:

As such, thirty years later, having gone to the place where lCe bTsun disappeared lCe sGom Nag po of mNar mDa' in Rong took out the outer, inner and secret oral lineage and the instruction was not promulgated to others apart from himself. These then spread widely in dBus and gTsang. Fifty years after the revelation by lCe sGom, I removed these unsurpassed secret cycles and the instruction was not promulgated to others apart from myself.

And his biography states:

After that, when he was living in the region of Sna khu in upper Nyang, before dawn there was a loud noise. Having arisen, he looked and in the sky there were rainbows, whorls of shimmering light, ḍākā and ḍākinīs, Mahākarunika, Tārā and the gurus of the past giving a prediction, "Listen! Amazing! The intimate instruction of buddhahood in a single life, the Dzogchen unsurpassed secret cycle is in a cliff that resembles a lion. The removal of that will have countless benefits for sentient beings. The Dharma that is enough to meet is amazing, just amazing!" and then they disappeared.

It is said that when he was eighteen years, Tashi Dorje did not understand the prediction. That evening, after thinking it over, a man wearing a white hat said to Tashi Dorje, "You will be given siddhi, go!".

That morning before dawn, [the man wearing a white hat] said “Go!”

Having left, that evening he arrived at Tsha ba Nyi ma mdar in lower Nyang. There were a group of many monks wearing yellow. Having sat, since he was given much food and drink, he wondered “That year there was a great famine. Should those be called siddhis?”

Again at dawn [the man wearing a white hat] said “Go!”

Those monks were drinking a lot of alcohol, and having many dharma conversations, and it is said that they were content in prajñā, hearing and contemplation.

Then, at noon he arrived somewhere, but he did not recognize the path. Again, he was guided by an upāsaka with a white hat. In the evening he arrived at sTag thabs, and just as he was lying down in an empty house, [the man wearing a white hat] said “Do not stay here, leave now!” and as soon as Tashi Dorje left the door, the house collapsed.

That evening, a great rain occurred, and so that night he stayed under an overhanging cliff. The [the man wearing a white hat] emanation brought a lot of food and drink.

Then, having crossed Rva lag tshugs, though there was a disturbance in the lower end of ‘O yug, since the emanation was fearless, on the day he reached “O yug, Tashi Dorje was extremely hungry and was given food by all the ladies who were cutting wood. Then he left and arrived at the base of a cliff that resembled a lion. After he became lost, he could not find it. He looked everywhere, but could not find it. He stayed because he could not return. Since he looked in the index, from the door where good grass was growing, in his hand he had a sharp weapon. Because he struck that [grass], the inside was revealed. Since he went inside, after sunrise he stayed in the center of a mandala. Since he dug with the sharp weapon, there was a mass of snakes and frogs all together. Having gradually cleared them away, he emerged above, and looked around, thinking in his mind “Dharma is my expertise. If there is wealth, I will be happy.” Then, after producing one hundred and eight indexes, he danced from great joy.

After that, he wrapped them all with a leather cord, and he looked in the cave of the valley. He could not see anything after dusk. At that time, again the upasaka brought light, food and drink and as soon as he looked at the books, the sound of a very terrifying voice arose in front of the door. “He is the emanation predicted for this, but older sister does not know him” and “I will and bring older sister.”

After that, at certain times, there were very terrifying voices, thinking that the cave was going to collapse, since his eyes fluttered, in front of the cave there was an extremely terrifying eye the size of a skillet, a mouth of boiling blood, baring a single fang, of which he was frightened. He wondered why he was encountering this?

Again, as in the prediction above, since he was not known by the older sister, she said:

I am Ekajati.

Offer one hundred and eight ganapujas.

Explain nothing for three years.

Then she departed. That upāsaka with the white hat was Upāśka Vajrasadhu.

He blocked the entrance of the cave. Since there was a small piece of turquoise, with one man he offered cow meat and three bushels of barely for one hundred and eight feasts.

In Nyang rTag rJed, he was greatly served by a faithful benefactress named Shag mo dKar mTsho, and he was able to write down the books completely.
This is why I think so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 12:58 AM

Title: Buddhahood in This Life

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hi all,

I just wanted to let anyone who is interested know that they can order my book, Buddhahood in This Life, from Wisdom Publications at a 30% discount directly from Wisdom using this link, <http://www.wisdompubs.org/book/buddhahood-life>, and the discount code: BLPD16. By doing so, you will very likely receive it earlier than the official Amazon date of 12/6/16, perhaps by as much as a month.

Thanks,

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Karma Nyingtik

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The supreme material treasure is the energetic treasure of space that is the universe from the perspective of the its inhabitants, it fulfills hopes like a wish-fulfilling gem...

dzogchungpa said:

Nice, I guess we are all tertons

May I ask what 'energetic' corresponds to in the Tibetan?

Malcolm wrote:

rtsal

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: How do you feel about Buddhists getting involved in politics?

Content:

Virgo said:

Of course, you have to fight for your rights ...

Kevin

Malcolm 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: Malcolm

Date: Friday, June 3rd, 2016 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Karma Nyingtik

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Apparently the whole universe is a terma, so the first terton would be ...

Malcolm wrote:

Guru Chowang in fact does make that identification.

dzogchungpa said:

Oh, that's interesting. What does he say?

Malcolm wrote:

The supreme material treasure is the energetic treasure of space that is the universe from the perspective of the its inhabitants, it fulfills hopes like a wish-fulfilling gem...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2016 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Karma Nyingtik

Content:

Iconodule said:

Wouldn't the first Terton be technically whoever discovered the Mahayana sutras (hidden in the Naga realm for 500 years)?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this is an interesting point. I think we can say Sangye Lama was among the first tertons working with Guru Padsmabhava material, for sure. Most people consider

termas to be teachings concealed by either Guru Rinpoche or the 25 disciples. For example, technically speaking, the Barchey Kunsel cycle was not concealed by Guru P, but rather by those disciples who heard that teaching.

Or, with Gongpa Zangthal, the cave of Zang Zag Lha drag was a place where people such as Padmasambhava, Mutig Tsenpo, Yeshe Tsogyal and so on would visit and conceal this and that teaching in five chambered casket taken out by Rigzin Godem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2016 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Karma Nyingtik

Content:

Iconodule said:

Wouldn't the first Terton be technically whoever discovered the Mahayana sutras (hidden in the Naga realm for 500 years)?

dzogchungpa said:

Apparently the whole universe is a terma, so the first terton would be ...

Malcolm wrote:

Guru Chowang in fact does make that identification.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2016 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Karma Nyingtik

Content:

aussiebloke said:

There is a Tsasum Dilrup that has been given many times by Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche , I seem to remember it being a rediscovered terma of Khyentse Wangpo originally from Sangye Lingpa , the first terton.

Malcolm wrote:

That is Sangye Lama, not Sangye Lingpa, and his claim to being the "first" terton (1000-1080 is a little arguable, since he had a younger contemporary, Trapa Ngonshe (1010-1090), who was also a terton.

Amazingly, Zhangton Tashi Dorje is always over looked in the lists of tertons, because for some strange reason, the Vima Nyinthig is never considered terma, though it is in fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2016 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: Germany is Germany!

Content:

Norwegian said:

Things will not improve. It will only get worse.

Malcolm wrote:

Meanwhile the US deports 1,000 hardworking people every day.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2016 at 7:03 PM

Title: Re: Seventh Root Downfall, Academia, Public Life

Content:

Kushi said:

All of this said - I still don't want to violate the trust of a teacher, or be engaged in behavior which is viewed as unambiguously unacceptable by the tradition as a whole, while simultaneously being a vow holder.

Malcolm wrote:

The tradition as a whole seems to be in support of publishing texts in English to make them available to a practitioner public.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2016 at 7:01 PM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

[

Where does nonarising fit into this?

Malcolm wrote:

When existence of something cannot be established, how can one establish its arising?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, June 2nd, 2016 at 9:45 AM

Title: Re: Ngakpa/Ngakma Teachers?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

OG Ngakpa

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2016 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Ngakpa/Ngakma Teachers?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Just find yourself a Throma Nagmo empowerment (with all the optional extras) and you'll be set!

If you were in Europe I would invite you to the one I am hosting in July with Loppon Ogyan Tenzin, unfortunately for you, you are in the USA.

Malcolm wrote:

Pema Dorje will be giving Troma this summer in a couple of places.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2016 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Seventh Root Downfall, Academia, Public Life

Content:

Indrajala said:

Keep in mind that the vast majority of Buddhist Tantric materials, be it in Sanskrit, Tibetan or Chinese, are now in the public domain and openly accessible.

fckw said:

You might be wrong. Either about "vast majority" or about "public" and "openly accessible".

Malcolm wrote:

Well, the only thing holding you back from reading the vast majority of "secret" Tibetan texts available to the Tibetan speaking public is knowledge of Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2016 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Ok so if we can forgive Malcolm for muddying the waters by claiming that statements of the order "I like ice cream" are views, and can agree that views are "theories about the nature of reality", then do you agree with Nagarjuna that the Buddha taught the dharma for the abandonment of all views?

Malcolm wrote:

I did not claim that my friend, you did. I said at the outset that the "views" Nāgārjuna was critiquing were views of existence and nonexistence. If you respond, this is not all he was critiquing, that he was critiquing the four extremes, the second two extremes are

merely repetitions of the first two: i.e., to say that something both exists and does not exist, is just a view of existence. To say that something neither exists nor does not exist, is just a view of nonexistence.

In the end, Nāgārjuna was aiming at views of permanence and annihilation, existence or nonexistence, which is why the only sūtra he cites in the whole MMK is the Inquiry of Kaśyapa. When the Buddha made such an argument against "yasti" and "nasti," he did so with respect to how things exist objectively. Thus it is entirely accurate to state that Madhyamaka is the study of the objective state of reality, whether or not there is such an objective state, a reality, and so on, or not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2016 at 6:26 AM

Title: Re: Karma Nyingtik

Content:

aussiebloke said:

Hello all

Do any of you yogis practice this cycle of teachings ?

Can you PM me if you do.

Many thanks

John

Malcolm wrote:

It is basically just a Vimalamitra Guru yoga, a supplement to the Vima Nyinthig.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2016 at 6:25 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

What kind of Dzogchen was available to Milarepa at the time?

Malcolm wrote:

Man ngag sde, for sure.

For example, most people have not understood that the song of the guidance of the six bardos is directly based on Dzogchen teachings. There is no teaching of four or six bardos outside of Dzogchen, not even in the Nyingma tantra cycles of Mahayoga and Anuyoga. The four or six bardos are based on man ngag sde.

BuddhaFollower said:

Where does Milarepa refer to the bardo of dharmata?

Also, this a new position of yours. You previously said Milarepa had access to what has become known as semde:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=36&t=16308&p=229664&hilit=sems+semde+Milarepa#p229664>

Malcolm wrote:

Read that song carefully, you will see it. The translation is very unclear of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2016 at 6:24 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

Bakmoon said:

gad rgyangs, I really think you are making a big fuss over what boils down to a semantic issue. According to you, what is the definition of the word "view" when Nagarjuna says he has no views?

Does this mean that he has no assertions about anything or that he makes no positive statements about anything whatsoever? That's problematic because his writings make positive assertions all the time.

What I gather from Malcolm here is that the correct and more restricted sense of the term 'view' in this context is ontological views, not conventional views about how things function in a worldly sense.

gad rgyangs said:

Malcolm just said that to say "The Buddha is the best of teachers" is a view. so wtf are you talking about? I agree that views in madhyamaka texts do not mean "a statement of any kind" but rather a theory about the nature of reality. It is these that are to be abandoned, including the notion of emptiness, for as MMK says at 22.11

"Empty" should not be asserted.

"Non-empty" should not be asserted.

Neither both nor neither should be asserted.

They are only used nominally. (MK 22: 11)

Malcolm wrote:

Maybe this is not such a good translation, since assertions can be only be used nominally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2016 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I agree that views in madhyamaka texts do not mean "a statement of any kind" but rather a theory about the nature of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is strange for you to say that now, since when I made the same observation above, you complained that no, in fact, "all views" was to be taken literally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2016 at 6:12 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

That is, we do not want to turn essencelessness itself into an essence.

Malcolm wrote:

Guess both Candrakīrti and Dzogchen blew it then, since both use this term, "essenceless essence."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2016 at 5:39 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

smcj said:

I think the passage just cited makes it clear that Milarepa's Dzogchen practice was a failure.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahaha, you think that was the only opportunity he had to practice and study Dzogchen? Milarepa studied with ten Nyingma teachers before he met Marpa, and did many years of retreat after Marpa passed on.

I don't think you can conclude his practice of Dzogchen was a failure at all. Why do you think he says he was "stabbed in the back by Dzogchen?"

smcj said:

As Cone and I have both been asking, other than that one song, can anybody find anything in his bio or other literature that substantiates that idea? If not then The last we hear of Dzogchen in Mila's story is his admitting failure and being motivated by that failure to start seeking out Marpa.

Malcolm wrote:

You have not carefully studied Mila's songs. For example, as I just pointed out, the scheme of the six barods is lifted directly from Dzogchen Man ngag sde.

The of course there is the song of the Dying Bonpo, where he treats themes of the great perfection quite explicitly.

But part of the problem is that you are not familiar with the teachings of Dzogchen, and so do not recognize them when they occur in Mila's songs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2016 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahaha, you think that was the only opportunity he had to practice and study Dzogchen? Milarepa studied with ten Nyingma teachers

BuddhaFollower said:

What kind of Dzogchen was available to Milarepa at the time?

Malcolm wrote:

Man ngag sde, for sure.

For example, most people have not understood that the song of the guidance of the six bardos is directly based on Dzogchen teachings. There is no teaching of four or six bardos outside of Dzogchen, not even in the Nyingma tantra cycles of Mahayoga and Anuyoga. The four or six bardos are based on man ngag sde.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2016 at 5:30 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

smcj said:

We can conclude that Milarepa had knowledge of and practiced both.

I think the passage just cited makes it clear that Milarepa's Dzogchen practice was a failure.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahaha, you think that was the only opportunity he had to practice and study Dzogchen? Milarepa studied with ten Nyingma teachers before he met Marpa, and did many years of retreat after Marpa passed on.

I don't think you can conclude his practice of Dzogchen was a failure at all. Why do you think he says he was "stabbed in the back by Dzogchen?"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2016 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: Seventh Root Downfall, Academia, Public Life

Content:

Quay said:

Yes you can do both, put food on the table and respect the secrecy aspects of what you are studying. It comes down to motivation and what you are telling your students in class and your peers in papers. It might be good to emphasize that you are teaching and studying something that is a living tradition, something very much alive and of great importance to other people. It is not like a study of Attic Greek or the Latin of ancient Rome where the likelihood of causing offense is remote.

I had a chance to reflect on HH Dalai Lama's words that Malcolm summarizes, where the former "...discerned that in our modern society, secrecy creates hostility and suspicion." This seems a wise view in our increasingly crowded and linked-together world. You can teach things already in the public domain if you note they are not museum pieces but rather living practices of great importance to many. Respect for the field of study is always a good thing & not to treat it as an abstract notion.

Of course if you engage in the practices yourself your whole life and mind may change & you may find yourself in a different situation if not dilemma, but that's true for any intense Vajrayana practices.

Malcolm wrote:

We also need to bear in mind that we are, as a society, a great deal more literate than societies were 1000 years ago in general. As such, while our modernism may give rise to a certain level of conceptual complexity which can be a obstacle for sure, on the other hand, the learning curve is lower since literacy is not a barrier at all. If literacy forms a barrier, it is because we are very conditioned by our world view, and it then becomes very hard to overcome our education in science and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2016 at 5:17 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For example, he clearly held the view that Buddha was the best of all teachers. If that is not a view, I don't know what is.

cloudburst said:

agree

Malcolm wrote:

It seems for our friend Dante, however, that holding that Buddha was the best of teachers was merely an "expedient."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2016 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

smcj said:

So can we provisionally conclude that, after meeting Marpa, Milarepa's practice was predominantly Mahamudra oriented and not Dzogchen oriented?

Malcolm wrote:

We can conclude that Milarepa had knowledge of and practiced both.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2016 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I never maintained that N had no views at all. I have always maintained that he had no view concerning existence and nonexistence.

For example, he clearly held the view that Buddha was the best of all teachers. If that is not a view, I don't know what is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, June 1st, 2016 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Its good to see you have finally accepted this.

I never maintained that N had no views at all. I have always maintained that he had no view concerning existence and nonexistence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2016 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Seventh Root Downfall, Academia, Public Life

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That is not the point of this discussion.

Sherab Dorje said:

So why don't you just humor me (and Karma Yeshe).

Malcolm wrote:

You are not the OP.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2016 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Seventh Root Downfall, Academia, Public Life

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That is not the point of this discussion.

Sherab Dorje said:

So why don't you just humor me (and Karma Yeshe)....HHDL has already pointed out that is a flawed approach.

And his reasoning was (please link if you cannot be bothered explaining)?

Malcolm wrote:

You can read up on his reasoning in the Kalacakra Initiation book. To summarize, he discerned that in our modern society, secrecy creates hostility and suspicion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2016 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: Seventh Root Downfall, Academia, Public Life

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot divulge someone else's practice, only they can do this.

Sherab Dorje said:

So if I know your practice and tell it to somebody else...

Malcolm wrote:

That is not the point of this discussion. The point is in terms of general samayas: what is appropriate for academic scholars to reveal and what is not.

If you take a strict approach, nothing should be discussed. But as I mentioned above, HHDL has already pointed out that is a flawed approach.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2016 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: Seventh Root Downfall, Academia, Public Life

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Dalai Lama has already weighed in on this subject, and he has stated with great clarity that at this point in time, Vajrayāna secrecy is more harmful than helpful. That being said, no one asserts that one must or even should divulge one's own practice.

You cannot divulge someone else's practice, only they can do this.

Moreover, in some schools, but not all, there is the principle of self-secrecy, that is, things only make sense if you have received instruction in this or that practice, something you cannot get from a book.

In general, Greg, there are no secrets anymore. It has all been published. Not every detail of every cycle of practice, but there is very little difference between one cycle and another in terms of the general outlines of creation and completion stage.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2016 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: Seventh Root Downfall, Academia, Public Life

Content:

Kushi said:

I ask because I do seem to encounter people with a more hardline view, i.e, that non-initiates of all types are forbidden from hearing the technical details of practice, seeing the mandala, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the traditional Indian way, but much has changed.

This is largely a show among Tibetans, since you can walk into any Tibetan monastery and see all the Yidams, Mandalas, implements and so on, since Vajrayāna is the state religion of Tibet.

Then there is the hilarity of the fact that Tibetans keep secret things that have been a normal part of Indian life for generation, things like prāṇāyama, mudras, etc.

In the end, it is up to you.

For myself, I don't really discuss details of practice or the particulars of what I practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2016 at 6:46 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All views can be summarized in two.

And if what you assert is true, than Nāgārjuna is a fool, because he advocates all kinds of views in various texts. So, either you have misinterpreted what he means by "views" (my opinion), or he is an idiot who contradicts himself.

gad rgyangs said:

he also says 8.8

Emptiness is taught by the conquerors as the expedient to get rid of all views.

But those for whom emptiness is a view have been called incurable.

I think that might help clarify things for you. His "views" as you call them are, by his own admission, "expedients" AKA useful fictions. And what are they useful for? For getting rid of all views, of course. Its really not complicated because he tells you exactly what he means.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't need you to clarify anything for me. That said, you yourself fail what you believe to be Nāgārjuna;s main thesis, that all views are to be eliminated since you hold this as a view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2016 at 6:24 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"All views" here is summarized as two in chapter fifteen: i.e. substantial existence and nonexistence.

gad rgyangs said:

"all views" is "sarvadr̥ṣṭi". the word "dr̥ṣṭi" does not appear in Chapter 15, please explain where in that chapter he is claiming that existence and non-existence "summarize" sarvadr̥ṣṭi.

perhaps you mean 15.10?

"It exists" is an eternalist view: "It does not exist" is an annihilationist idea.

Therefore the wise one should not have recourse to either existence or nonexistence.

or 15.6

Intrinsic nature and extrinsic nature, existent and nonexistent-

who see these do not see the truth of the Buddha's teachings.

wait thats already 4 things he's rejecting. In fact, the entire MMK is about rejecting views, not just two. In fact its about rejecting all views, just like he says.

Malcolm wrote:

All views can be summarized in two.

And if what you assert is true, than Nāgārjuna is a fool, because he advocates all kinds of views in various texts. So, either you have misinterpreted what he means by "views" (my opinion), or he is an idiot who contradicts himself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2016 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He states in the VV that he has no propositions/thesis concerning svabhāva as defined by his opponents. He does not say he has no views at all. Madhyamaka is not a simple minded "I have no view" proposition.

gad rgyangs said:

then why does the MMK end thusly? MMK 27.30:

I salute Gautama, who, based on compassion,
taught the true Dharma for the abandonment of all views.

Malcolm wrote:

"All views" here is summarized as two in chapter fifteen: i.e. substantial existence and nonexistence.

It is not like the position of Sañjaya Belaṭṭhiputta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2016 at 4:39 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

And I disagree about Bhavya: he got it about as wrong as you possible could, with his insistence that Madhyamaka should be making positive statements about the nature of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

He never does this.

gad rgyangs said:

you know very well the whole svatantra vs prasanga thing is about this very issue.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the whole svatantra/prasanga debate is about whether one needs a formal syllogism to prove emptiness to opponents. The difference between the two is merely

didactic, not substantive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2016 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

nowhere is he saying that either dependence or emptiness are "the reality of phenomena". They are both dependent designations, i.e. useful fictions which help us to walk the middle path between extremes of asserting a reality of phenomena and denying that there are phenomena at all.

Malcolm wrote:

He is saying precisely that the reality of phenomena is dependent origination and emptiness, depending on which way one is seeing things.

For example, in the 70 he says:

The nature of all things is empty.

For what reason? The nature of all things

is an assembly of causes and conditions.

or, because there is neither being nor nonbeing

in each and every thing, they are empty

He is here declaring that the nature or reality (the state of being pertaining to things) of all things is emptiness.

He says,

Having realized things are empty,

one will not be confused because of seeing correctly

gad rgyangs said:

He clearly says in the VV that he has no view to defend. Do you think he was wrong about himself?

Malcolm wrote:

He states in the VV that he has no propositions/thesis concerning svabhāva as defined by his opponents. He does not say he has no views at all. For example, he clearly states in the MMK that he prefers the Sammitya view of karma.

Your claim is similar to the mistaken assertion made by some who claim that Candrakīrti never resorts to syllogisms, which in fact he clearly does in the opening lines of the MAV. What Candra disputes is not syllogistic reasoning in its entirety, but rather, syllogistic reasoning applied to emptiness.

Likewise, he clearly asserts the view in the VV that there is no svabhāva in phenomena. Madhyamaka is not a simple minded "I have no view" proposition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2016 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

And I disagree about Bhavya: he got it about as wrong as you possible could, with his insistence that Madhyamaka should be making positive statements about the nature of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

He never does this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2016 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

nowhere is he saying that either dependence or emptiness are "the reality of phenomena". They are both dependent designations, i.e. useful fictions which help us to walk the middle path between extremes of asserting a reality of phenomena and denying that there are phenomena at all.

Malcolm wrote:

He is saying precisely that the reality of phenomena is dependent origination and emptiness, depending on which way one is seeing things.

For example, in the 70 he says:

The nature of all things is empty.

For what reason? The nature of all things

is an assembly of causes and conditions.

or, because there is neither being nor nonbeing

in each and every thing, they are empty

He is here declaring that the nature or reality (the state of being pertaining to things) of all things is emptiness.

He says,

Having realized things are empty,

one will not be confused because of seeing correctly

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2016 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

That would be fine except it is a fundamental misreading of Nagarjuna. All descriptions of reality including "empty" are nothing but (perhaps) useful fictions, and should in no way be taken as "objective states of phenomena". As soon as you say "X is the reality of phenomena" then you have fallen into an extreme.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, then you have to fault Nāgārjuna on two points: he states that dependent origination is the reality of phenomena, and he states that emptiness is the reality of all phenomena.

After all:

That which arises in dependence,
that is explained as emptiness,
that is designated in dependence,
that is the middle way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2016 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You claimed that reality was not objective.

gad rgyangs said:

no, I said reality cannot be described as having an "objective state", as you claim:

Malcolm wrote:

I never said reality "had an objective state," nevertheless, reality, since it applies to all phenomena, whatever it may be, can be considered an objective state for the purpose of discussion. For example, if all phenomena are empty, the objective state of all phenomena is empty, and that is their reality.

In other words, Dante, you are wasting time quibbling over nothing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 31st, 2016 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

smcj said:

The reason "Wisdom", with all its Buddha qualities, is NOT subject to Madhyamaka analysis is exactly because it is non-manifest and cannot be taken as an object of consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

What does "non-manifest" mean? Does that mean it is invisible?

smcj said:

Yes

Not accessible to the six senses?

Yes

How does this non-manifest wisdom differ from the horns of a rabbit?

Because it is full of Buddha-qualities, is the source of the Rupakayas, and is a source of Refuge.

Malcolm wrote:

And people wonder why lower vehicles are just intellectual speculations...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 30th, 2016 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

smcj said:

The reason "Wisdom", with all its Buddha qualities, is NOT subject to Madhyamaka analysis is exactly because it is non-manifest and cannot be taken as an object of consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

What does "non-manifest" mean? Does that mean it is invisible? Not accessible to the six senses? How does this non-manifest wisdom differ from the horns of a rabbit?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 30th, 2016 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

No, I said:

Malcolm wrote:

Your statement is a flat out self-contradiction.

gad rgyangs said:

and the contradiction is...?

Malcolm wrote:

You claimed that reality was not objective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 30th, 2016 at 11:26 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you say there is no objective state of reality, you are saying that there is no reality, and that is an objective statement, since it covers everything.

gad rgyangs said:

No, I said:

not "no reality", but no "objective state of reality". of course there is reality (here we are) , but it has no description, state, or anything else that can be termed "objective" .

Malcolm wrote:

Your statement is a flat out self-contradiction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 30th, 2016 at 11:18 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Your "no bank account" is every bit as much a view as any view you think you are negating. If you really had no view, you would not even have chimed in on this thread. But since you did, it shows you have a view.

gad rgyangs said:

to call Madhyamaka's deconstruction of views itself a "view" is confusing: "view" (dṛṣṭi) should be reserved for claims about the nature of reality and not deconstructions of such claims.

I "chimed in" first merely to say:

according to Madhyamaka there is no objective state of reality.
to which you replied:

Malcolm wrote:

That is the objective state of reality, i.e., no reality.

gad rgyangs said:

which is what I am accusing of being a view. It is not a statement about other's views of reality being inadequate or contradictory, it is itself a view, that is, a claim that there is an objective state of reality & a description of that purported objective state. I think the problematic word here is "objective" which implies a real state and not just poetic metaphors falling way short of any objectivity, said poetic metaphors including, of course, Madhyamaka, and Buddhism itself.

Malcolm wrote:

If you say there is no objective state of reality, you are saying that there is no reality, and that is an objective statement, since it covers everything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 30th, 2016 at 10:48 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

MiphamFan said:

I think your bank account analogy is confusing.

Maybe a better analogy is fiat currency, culminating in bitcoin?

It gives lie to the idea of intrinsic value -- all value is based on belief in the end, and belief is based on nothing.

Malcolm wrote:

A bank account is a wrapper, which only has value in dependence on whether we invest it with value. Reality is also such a wrapper.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 30th, 2016 at 10:38 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

MMK 27.30:

this is a view:

Malcolm wrote:

Is it? If so you have to accept the consequence that you advanced it.

gad rgyangs said:

nope. this is what I said:

not "no reality", but no "objective state of reality". of course there is reality (here we are) , but it has no description, state, or anything else that can be termed "objective" .

your statement claims there is an "objective state of reality", mine denies it. Your statement is the "bank account with no bank account in it" view, and mine is "no bank account", which is the same as "no view".

Malcolm wrote:

No, I simply stated that madhyamaka concerned the investigation into such a state. You advanced the claim there was no objective state, which I assented to.

Your "no bank account" is every bit as much a view as any view you think you are negating. If you really had no view, you would not even have chimed in on this thread. But since you did, it shows you have a view.

Btw, saying there is no money in that bank account is identical to saying there is no essence in that phenomena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 30th, 2016 at 10:06 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

MMK 27.30:

I salute Gautama, who, based on compassion,
taught the true Dharma for the abandonment of all views.
this is a view:

Malcolm wrote:

The objective state of reality is the absence of any objective "description, state or anything else that can be termed objective."

Is it? If so you have to accept the consequence that you advanced it.

All I really said was that madhyamaka concerned the study of the objective state of reality. I did not say anything about what that state was.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 30th, 2016 at 7:28 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

smcj said:

But that is vastly different than saying there is no bank account. The null set does not equal the set that contains the null set.

Malcolm wrote:

Having a bank account without money is equivalent to having no bank account.

gad rgyangs said:

not at all. a bank account with no money could have money, while no bank account cannot. reality cannot have an objective state, including that of "not having an objective state"

Malcolm wrote:

A bank account with no money is like a car without wheels, it does not function. Such a bank account and such a car are just the same as non-accounts and non-cars in so far as they do not function for the purpose for which they are assigned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 30th, 2016 at 6:45 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

well, no. what you say contradicts itself and is tantamount to saying that everything is empty except emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no contradiction. If you have no money in the bank, there is no money in the bank, and it really does not matter how you describe that absence.

smcj said:

But that is vastly different than saying there is no bank account. The null set does not equal the set that contains the null set.

Malcolm wrote:

Having a bank account without money is equivalent to having no bank account.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 30th, 2016 at 6:37 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

not "no reality", but no "objective state of reality". of course there is reality (here we are) , but it has no description, state, or anything else that can be termed "objective" .

Malcolm wrote:

The objective state of reality is the absence of any objective "description, state or anything else that can be termed objective."

gad rgyangs said:

well, no. what you say contradicts itself and is tantamount to saying that everything is empty except emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no contradiction. If you have no money in the bank, there is no money in the bank, and it really does not matter how you describe that absence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 30th, 2016 at 6:14 AM

Title: Re: Meet your new Chinese Overlords - From POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Saoshun said:

Saudi Arabia just joined the game blaming US WTC Attack to be conspired by them itself.

5 years? It can start this year but I will keep 5 years for sure.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 30th, 2016 at 6:00 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

according to Madhyamaka there is no objective state of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

Than that is the objective stated of reality, i.e., no reality.

gad rgyangs said:

not "no reality", but no "objective state of reality". of course there is reality (here we are) , but it has no description, state, or anything else that can be termed "objective" .

Malcolm wrote:

The objective state of reality is the absence of any objective "description, state or anything else that can be termed objective."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 30th, 2016 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

heart said:

Milarepas Ngondro was building stuff for Marpa, not an accumulation of numbers.

Malcolm wrote:

And that is not even really certain.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 30th, 2016 at 3:37 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

according to Madhyamaka there is no objective state of reality.

smcj said:

Isn't that the second extreme of non-existence?

Malcolm wrote:

No, when we say there is "no reality," it is similar to saying "My bank account is empty."

When you say your bank account is empty, you are not saying that it is empty of money that was once there. You are saying there is no money to be found there when you check your balance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 30th, 2016 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

according to Madhyamaka there is no objective state of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

Than that is the objective stated of reality, i.e., no reality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 30th, 2016 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Medicine cannabinoid extracts?

Content:

davyji said:

Is this due to illegality? And negative stigmatism? Corpocracy control?

Hemp & Marijuana grow wild throughout Himalayan regions.

dave

Malcolm wrote:

The Tibetans simply had little use for it in their pharmacopeia. Opium, the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 29th, 2016 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Quality is far more important than quantity.

Sherab Dorje said:

Where did I say that quality is not better than quantity? I think people, in their bid to support their own agenda viz Ngondro, are being deliberately obtuse.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't have an agenda against Ngondro (i.e. the four 100,000). I have told some students they should do it, and other students it is not entirely necessary for them to do any ngondro beyond having some experience with each practice.

A student once asked my guru, Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, if he should do Ngondro before Dzogchen. My teacher's reply to him was that all of his students were Dzogchen practitioners, in essence, his reply was "no." That said, my teacher's ngondro liturgies are beautiful. I have indeed told some of my students that they should practice at least KDL's short ngondro (without focusing too much on accumulations) because it is a fresh treasure teachings, still warm from the breath of the dākinis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 29th, 2016 at 11:12 PM

Title: The real meaning of Madhyamaka and Yogacara

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Madhyamaka is the study of the objective state of reality.

Yogacara is the study of the subjective process of awakening.

When understood in this way, they are non-contradictory and harmonious.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 29th, 2016 at 6:15 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

heart said:

I think you really have to think about how you accumulate wisdom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 29th, 2016 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I didn't say that the numbers get you to "the point". I said that, theoretically, once you make the effort to start accumulating, within the process of accumulating those sort of

numbers, chances are you will gain a result. If you haven't gained it by 100,000 then I guess you need to look for another avenue of approach. And don't be so sure that you did not achieve what was meant to be achieved. It can be a really subtle change sometimes.

Malcolm wrote:

Quality is far more important than quantity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 29th, 2016 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Medicine cannabinoid extracts?

Content:

davyji said:

Are cannabinoids used in Tibetan Medicine?

As whole plant, extracts etc. ingested or topical?

dave

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 29th, 2016 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

He says he has not completed a Ngondro. That theoretically means that he has received Ngondro, started it, but did not complete it.

Malcolm wrote:

So what? Why is that important to you?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 29th, 2016 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

...is it working?

Malcolm wrote:

The only question that really matters is, is it working for you? If so, then why complain, if not then there is something to complain about.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2016 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: What kind of diet do Tibetan medicine doctors recommend for someone with IBS?

Content:

Mkoll said:

I'm guessing it's based on the individual, but perhaps there are more general practices that apply to everybody with certain conditions. Or is it actually necessary to see a Tibetan medicine doctor in person and have them give even the most basic diet practices for this condition?

Malcolm wrote:

You need to see a doctor. TM is not one size fits all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2016 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Meet your new IMF/World Bank Overlords - split from troubling events

Content:

Queequeg said:

This whole Greece thing sounds familiar...

Malcolm 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: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2016 at 2:59 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I guess this brings us back around to the putative topic of this thread, "Obstacles and their elimination".

Malcolm 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: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2016 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Troubling developments in the South China Sea

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

hence the Troika's sheer unadulterated joy at the fact that the present austerity measures are implemented by a left-wing anti-establishment government... nothing so useful to the preservers of the status quo as forcing the anti-establishment left to betray its principles),

Iconodule said:

I haven't kept up very well with this stuff. Has there ever been a satisfying explanation for Syriza's abrupt about-face once they took power?

Malcolm wrote:

No balls.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2016 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

heh

Queequeg said:

That seriously is a good way to get yourself whacked.

Malcolm 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: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2016 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

On second thought, maybe not.

Queequeg said:

If my own thoughts annoy the crap out of me, other people's drive me to murder. But

they're all my own appearances, so...

```
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]
```

Malcolm wrote:

heh

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2016 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

the path is transmitted to the student if they fail to achieve buddhahood during the empowerment

Astus said:

What sort of thing is the path to be given to another? Or, asking in another way, what is the medium between teacher and student?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, Astus, why do you find a qualified Guru and find out for yourself.

Astus said:

That depends on what teachings you practice, and whether they are based on mind or pristine consciousness.

Wisdom first needs to be attained - hence the movement from ignorance to knowledge.

Then, with that knowledge, that wisdom or pristine consciousness, one can progress on.

That's what happens in all paths, where one goes from ordinary being to a noble one, and from noble practitioner to a non-practitioner. Unless it is the sudden enlightenment version, where with one step one goes from ordinary to buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

And then there is the third option. Pristine consciousness is innate. The stage of liberation is first. Vajrasattva lost his jewel, and needed to find it again.

Astus said:

We could say even of the 9th vehicle that it is very much loaded with theories. Does that make it then intellectual? It certainly doesn't look as simple and free from theoretical matters as Pure Land and Zen.

Malcolm wrote:

It is true that lower Atiyoga is also considered intellectual and theoretical.

Astus said:

The Vajrayāna is available to us in this epoch because it is the worst possible epoch in which liberation through Dharma is possible. Even Mahāyāna teachings are not always available. For example, Maitreya will not teach Vajrayāna.

Don't buddhas know all the teachings of all the vehicles? If they do, one can learn them just by asking for them.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Buddhas don't proffer teachings like merchants displaying wares in the market. They teach according to circumstances. Since Sukhavati is so nice, easy and blissful, there is no reason at all to teach a swift path at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2016 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: Troubling developments in the South China Sea

Content:

Queequeg said:

If you owe the bank thousands, the bank owns you. If you owe the bank trillions, you own the bank.

You Greeks might want to consider borrowing even more from the Germans.

Sherab Dorje said:

We are being forced to borrow money from everybody in order to pay back the interest on the initial loan.

The problem is that when you owe the World Bank and IMF trillions then they own you, your kids, your grandkids and a couple of generations that are as yet unborn.

So this "owe trillions..." fantasy is just wishful thinking and "head in sand" behaviour.

Malcolm wrote:

Default, dude. Declare bankruptcy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2016 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Guru yoga is a method, it is not the goal.

Sherab Dorje said:

Yes, and...? ie How does that mean that it does not qualify as an essential teaching?

Malcolm wrote:

Guru yoga, while indispensable, is not the main point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2016 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

They have to given in person, otherwise, there is no transmission.

Astus said:

What is transmitted from teacher to disciple?

Malcolm wrote:

That depends on the teacher and the disciple. But ideally, through the dependent origination of the teacher's realization, the substances of the empowerment which are used to induce certain experiences and the confident faith of the disciple, as well as the mutual and simultaneously desire to engage in the process of transmission, the path is transmitted to the student if they fail to achieve buddhahood during the empowerment.

Astus said:

They hope there is a mother, but their desperation is driven by the fact that they are not sure. It is the same with Pure Land Buddhism. They may have convinced themselves, but in reality, they will never be sure until they find themselves in Sukhavati.

If what you mean by uncertainty is that one can never know for sure whether there is a slice of cheese left in the fridge as long as one doesn't go there and opens the door, then I think it's a level of unconfirmed hope we all have to live with every day.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends on what teachings you practice, and whether they are based on mind or pristine consciousness.

Astus said:

Direct perception is always certain. This is the difference between lower and higher vehicles in general.

How is direct perception certain? We all see that the sun goes up and down. Does the sun actually go up and down? Or do you mean that first hand experience of the validity of the teachings is better than only believing in it based on a level of theoretical confirmation? If so, then I see no difference between the vehicles, they all point to seeing the truth for oneself. At the same time, isn't it the case that in the nine vehicles scheme all that the lower vehicles assume to be direct realisations are actually false? That is, it just shows how direct perception is uncertain.

Malcolm wrote:

They all use the same rhetoric, "ehi, paśya," come and see. But in reality, the eight lower vehicles are based on intellectual theories, not pristine consciousness.

Astus said:

There is no suffering in Sukhavati, so rapid means are not needed there. It is similar with our situation, the more pain-free the eon in which we live, the lower the teachings are available to us. Since there is no pain at all in Sukhavati, the path taught there is the longest one.

What do you base that idea on? Bodhisattvas are not in a hurry because they feel uncomfortable, but to liberate all the others.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

The Vajrayāna is available to us in this epoch because it is the worst possible epoch in which liberation through Dharma is possible. Even Mahāyāna teachings are not always available. For example, Maitreya will not teach Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2016 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In the late 50's, there was a western student of Jamyang Khyente Chokyi Lodo who was with him before he died in Sikkim. Standing on his balcony, looking over a crowd of Tibetans, he said to this fellow, "You see those Tibetans? Some of them have done ten ngondros. But they have never taken the time to seek more essential teachings. What a pity."

M

Sherab Dorje said:

More essential than Guru Yoga?

Malcolm wrote:

Guru yoga is a method, it is not the goal.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2016 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

heart said:

To tell you the truth Cone I am pretty sure he would have benefited more from almost any other practice that was done for its own sake rather than for accumulate a certain number. Endless Ngondros is a very bad habit, will not help you next life either.

/magnus

conebeckham said:

I don't think ngondro, if properly approached, can ever be a "very bad habit." Then again, I like endless ngondros. It's unfortunate the way it's presented as a "task," or as a "prerequisite." Truth to tell, much of this attitude is fostered by Western students, and not by the teachers themselves--at least, that's been my experience.

Malcolm wrote:

In the late 50's, there was a western student of Jamyang Khyente Chokyi Lodo who was with him before he died in Sikkim. Standing on his balcony, looking over a crowd of Tibetans, he said to this fellow, "You see those Tibetans? Some of them have done ten ngondros. But they have never taken the time to seek more essential teachings. What a pity."

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2016 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are no invisible forces at play in Vajrayāna — if you think so, you have not understood anything.

Astus said:

That's good. Then empowerments work from a record as well as through live broadcast.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course they don't, Astus. They have to given in person, otherwise, there is no transmission.

Astus said:

Crying out to Amitabha like a lost child can hardly be described as pratyahara and Buddhānusr̥ti.

A child, when crying out, knows that there is the mother who can help. Similarly, one has faith in Amitabha to come and help.

Malcolm wrote:

They hope there is a mother, but their desperation is driven by the fact that they are not sure. It is the same with Pure Land Buddhism. They may have convinced themselves, but in reality, they will never be sure until they find themselves in Sukhavati.

Astus said:

It is not really certain at all.

Then there are no certain teachings, Pure Land or not.

Malcolm wrote:

Direct perception is always certain. This is the difference between lower and higher vehicles in general.

Astus said:

These are not guarantees that these buddhas teach the short and quick path. These are listed as opportunities for gathering merit and hearing the teachings. Nothing about what teachings may be heard are mentioned.

Wouldn't a buddha teach the most beneficial and efficient method? And even if someone's karma requires the long road, that is the same situation in this life.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

There is no suffering in Sukhavati, so rapid means are not needed there. It is similar with our situation, the more pain-free the eon in which we live, the lower the teachings are available to us. Since there is no pain at all in Sukhavati, the path taught there is the longest one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2016 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

If the tantric teaching of sleep luminosity is supposed to be much higher than śamatha, how come it doesn't result in common siddhis?

For example Hinayana practitioner Dipa Ma mastered śamatha and was witnessed to walk through walls and fly in the air.

If sleep luminosity is a higher state than the jhanas, how come it doesn't result in the same abilities?

Malcolm wrote:

If you become a buddha, will you be lacking any siddhis?

BuddhaFollower said:

Of course Buddhas have all siddhis.

But I don't see what that has to do with anything.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, siddhis are a function of mundane concentration on mantras, etc. They are not really important in the path, in and of themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2016 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Then people die of fatal diseases without ever practicing much more than śamatha.

BuddhaFollower said:

If the tantric teaching of sleep luminosity is supposed to be much higher than śamatha, how come it doesn't result in common siddhis?

For example Hinayana practitioner Dipa Ma mastered śamatha and was witnessed to walk through walls and fly in the air.

If sleep luminosity is a higher state than the jhanas, how come it doesn't result in the same abilities?

Malcolm wrote:

If you become a buddha, will you be lacking any siddhis?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2016 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The difference of course is that Vajrayāna has many sure methods for attaining awakening in this life with this body.

Iconodule said:

What do you mean "sure"? Because the possibility of a dramatic fall and rebirth in hell realms due to breaking samaya seems to make the path less than sure.

Malcolm wrote:

The four defeats are irreparable. Samaya vows on the other hand are very easily repaired. In order to really break samaya, you have to turn your back on Buddhadharma completely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 28th, 2016 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is not certain. Why? There are four causes required for birth in Sukhavati: the aspiration to do so, recollection of Amitabha, accumulation of virtue and dedication of merit. All four are required, as dictated by the 19th aspiration.

Astus said:

The minimal requirements are faith and vow. Beyond that everything else are commendable but not necessary. On this both the Chinese and Japanese masters agree.

Malcolm wrote:

That is nice for them.

Astus said:

All of these things depend on faith in something that may or may not happen after one dies.

Same goes for rebirth in general. Not to mention all the invisible forces at play in Vajrayana, like the whole role of a guru and empowerments.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no invisible forces at play in Vajrayāna — if you think so, you have not understood anything.

Astus said:

Merely crying out to Amitabha like a lost child searching for its mother is not sufficient. Mahasthamaprapta used this comparison (Surangama Sutra, tr new BTTS, p 230, 232-233):

...In order to enter samādhi, I chose no other method than to gather in the six faculties while continuously maintaining a pure mindfulness of the Buddha. This is the best method."

Malcolm wrote:

Crying out to Amitabha like a lost child can hardly be described as pratyahara and Buddhānusmṛti.

Astus said:

This is not certain.

As much as the sutras are certain, so it is this certain.

Malcolm wrote:
It is not really certain at all.

Astus said:
This is also not certain.
Why wouldn't it be? That's what the Buddha says in the sutra, it's a feature of Sukhavati.
There are even vows for those (7, 9, 23).

Malcolm wrote:
These are not guarantees that these buddhas teach the short and quick path. These are listed as opportunities for gathering merit and hearing the teachings. Nothing about what teachings may be heard are mentioned.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 11:37 PM
Title: Re: Rate of flow of time in different realms
Content:
MiphamFan said:
In Abhidharma they talk about how a thousand years for a human are one deva-day and so on.

But do they mention anything about comparing the rate of flow of time?

e.g.:
I lived as a human in 500 CE on Earth and died. I went to a hell and have to spend millions of years in hell. Is that a subjective experience of millions of years for me, the hell-being, or is it related directly to Earth human-years? Basically, is it possible for me as a human who died in 500 CE and went to a hell realm to be a human here today?

Malcolm wrote:
It is possible. Perhaps you spent a couple of minutes in hell.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 11:09 PM
Title: Re: What is Sutra Mahamudra?
Content:
Kelwin said:
Would that be the Gompopa certified party-line?

Malcolm wrote:
It is stated by Kongtrul quite clearly in the Encyclopedia of knowledge, and was directly communicated to me by Khenpo Tsultrim Gyatso. So, I don't see how these two sources could be anymore authoritative.

conebeckham said:

Yes, this is correct. I heard exactly the same from KTG.

As I have said numerous times here and at E Sangha, I don't know of any Lama or disciple who practices only Sutra Mahamudra. I certainly have not met anyone who claims realization due only to a "Sutra Mahamudra" path-but then, I've not met anyone who claims realization, period. Having said that, I've known many who expressed that they had insights of various kinds due to practices taught as part of what we could call primarily Sutra Mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, so I don't quite understand why this kicks up a hornet's nest every time it is mentioned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Iconodule said:

Who said it was an end in itself? Malcolm introduced the dichotomy of faith and direct perception, as if faith wasn't a prerequisite in Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

When one has direct perception, one no longer needs faith.

Iconodule said:

Okay, but that's not what you said. You suggested that Pure Land requires faith whereas Vajrayana is direct perception. Clearly both paths require faith. No one said faith was an end in itself. Presumably those beings reborn in Sukhavati will experience direct perception.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not suggest that. Of course faith is necessary. But it is not sufficient.

Also Vajrayāna, in general, is a path which is based in mind and intellect, and not the direct perception of pristine consciousness.

The difference of course is that Vajrayāna has many sure methods for attaining awakening in this life with this body. The Pure Land traditions, being based in sūtra, have none of these. This is especially the case in Jodo Shinshu, where such methods are eschewed as being jiriki, self-powered.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

There are individual saṃskāra / saṅkhāra / 'du-byed and people make their "decisions" as to what is a fitting path for them, based on those.

Malcolm wrote:

Often they are told by ignorant Lamas and Dharma center denizens that they must do x before they do y. Then people die of fatal diseases without ever practicing much more than śamatha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Vasana said:

If faith leads one to uncontrived Prajna , then so be it.

If faith is seen as an end rather than a means to an end then it can only take you so far.

Iconodule said:

Who said it was an end in itself? Malcolm introduced the dichotomy of faith and direct perception, as if faith wasn't a prerequisite in Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

When one has direct perception, one no longer needs faith.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Iconodule said:

It's one thing to know that you have something learn, and another to think that this particular teacher can show it.

Malcolm wrote:

If you wish to remain in a shroud of doubt, no teacher can help, not even the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Astus said:

That is, even if one has some doubts, one can attain birth. Not to mention those who commit all sorts of evil deeds and are totally lost in delusions.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not certain. Why? There are four causes required for birth in Sukhavati: the aspiration to do so, recollection of Amitabha, accumulation of virtue and dedication of merit. All four are required, as dictated by the 19th aspiration.

All of these things depend on faith in something that may or may not happen after one dies. It is not like someone is awarded a little certificate of certainty of birth in the Sukhavati.

Merely crying out to Amitabha like a lost child searching for its mother is not sufficient.

Astus said:

Well, what about those who have committed the five actions which result in immediate rebirth in lower realms? They are excluded.

Actually, they are not. It states in the Contemplation Sutra that even those who commit the five worst actions can attain birth by remembering Amitabha. May read more on it from Shinran <http://shinranworks.com/the-major-expositions/chapter-on-shinjin/>.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not certain.

Astus said:

Yes, after incalculable eons, the same as any other sūtra based path.

If you think there is a shorter path, then it is available in Sukhavati, simply because all beings there are free to visit any number of buddhas, not to mention Amitabha himself, and the present bodhisattvas.

Malcolm wrote:

This is also not certain.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Iconodule said:

For the vast majority of Vajrayana practitioners, it's not like a guru comes up to you and

says, "Hey, check this out" and suddenly you're enlightened.

Malcolm wrote:

Direct perception \neq "enlightenment."

If you want to understand this, find a Dzogchen master.

Iconodule said:

With the assumption that he has something to show me, ie, faith.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, if you don't think there is something you can be shown, then there is no point in looking, is there?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is a difference between faith and direct perception. It is up to us to choose which path we want to follow, the former or the latter.

Iconodule said:

For the vast majority of Vajrayana practitioners, it's not like a guru comes up to you and says, "Hey, check this out" and suddenly you're enlightened.

Malcolm wrote:

Direct perception \neq "enlightenment."

If you want to understand this, find a Dzogchen master.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am not proselytizing anything, I was answering questions put to me. if people want to practice Pure Land Buddhism, they should.

There is a difference between faith and direct perception. It is up to us to choose which path we want to follow, the former or the latter.

Sherab Dorje said:

Technically speaking it is not up to "us". There is this thing called karma vipakka which has been building up through the course of countless "us" and happens to have ripened

here and now. For some it has ripened as faith and for others it has ripened in the form of direct perception.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a correct interpretation of karma vipaka. The way you present it, people have no choice in their paths. This is nonsense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 8:48 PM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And as I have repeated already, this sūtra mahāmudra was elaborated for those who did not have the capacity for Vajrayāna...

Sherab Dorje said:

And that is bad for what reason exactly?

One of my teachers is totally into the Sutra Mahamudra thing. He teaches mainly to people that don't even want to know about empowerment. Some received them by "mistake" but most don't give a shit about them. So is it bad that there is a system out there that points out one's true nature to people, outside of the whole rigmarole of Vajrayana ritual?

Malcolm wrote:

No, that system is called "Prajñāpāramitā," aka, the path of common Mahāyāna. Calling Prajñāpāramitā meditation "mahāmudra" does not speed up the path. It is still a long slow path requiring three incalculable eons to complete.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 8:45 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Astus said:

All who have faith in Amitabha and vows to be born there, will be born there. And once in Sukhavati, no more problems, and buddhahood is guaranteed.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, after incalculable eons, the same as any other sūtra based path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Them's the breaks, huh? What you want Amitabha to do? Hand out "Get Out of Jail Free" cards? I'm sure he would if he could.

But seriously, you know I love and respect you but this whole "Dzogchen is the best, forget about the rest..." deal is embarrassing, frankly. I mean, I am glad that you have found a new niche for yourself, but busting everybody's chops about it ain't gonna win you any friends. Mainly because even if you were to proselytise 'til you were blue in the face, if somebody does not have the karma for it...

So... Live and let live! If somebody is not in the business of accruing negative outcomes, then just let them do their thing.

It's not like Pure Landers are sacrificing vestal virgins or something, that's more like something we Vajrayanis would be into.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not proselytizing anything, I was answering questions put to me. If people want to practice Pure Land Buddhism, they should.

There is a difference between faith and direct perception. It is up to us to choose which path we want to follow, the former or the latter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 8:34 PM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

dzoki said:

No it does not show that it is an independent tradition, but it shows that it is and was a practice system that can be applied independent of two stages.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think these texts show this.

dzoki said:

Also I forgot to mention the mahamudra instruction lineage of Vajrapani and Asukha. Marpa Lotsawa received some teachings on mahamudra from Maitripa, but by far not all, Maitripa passed his instructions onto his student Vajrapani, who gave them to Asukha, Asukha came to Tibet and taught them to various disciples including Rechungpa, this tradition is known as lower or eastern mahamudra and the teaching was called (according to Rechungpa's biography White, red and black mahamudra). Vajrapani himself towards the end of his life went to Tsang in Tibet together with his disciple Dharmashri and taught mahamudra to several Tibetan disciples, this lineage was known as upper or western mahamudra.

There is also lineage of nepalese guru Nirupa a student of another disciple of Maitripa, Karopa.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but this does not indicate that these upadeshas were transmitted to people who lacked necessary empowerments and so forth.

You will recall, the dividing line between Sūtra and Secret Mantra is empowerment. You will also recall that the mahāmudra we are discussing does not even belong to lower tantra (Mahāmudra in lower tantra refers to the commitment to mediate one's body as the body of the deity).

And as I have repeated already, this sūtra mahāmudra was elaborated for those who did not have the capacity for Vajrayāna, as can be easily verified by reading Kongtrul's description of sūtra mahāmudra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 8:25 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Astus said:

Good point. That is another reason for recommending the Pure Land path over the path of sages (i.e. aryas). All who have faith in Amitabha and vows to be born there, will be born there. And once in Sukhavati, no more problems, and buddhahood is guaranteed.

Malcolm wrote:

No, there are problems in the pure land, such as being born inside a lotus and stuck there for 18,000,000 human years.

Sherab Dorje said:

That is hardly a problem if you compare it to cycling through samsara for 18 million human years continuing to engage in even more negative karma the outcomes of which will be another 18 trillion human years of being reborn in the three lower realms. It is actually a pretty decent offer.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, what about those who have committed the five actions which result in immediate rebirth in lower realms? They are excluded.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

maybay said:

Yes I do. Not as a requirement for attainment though, but as a criteria for engagement. If you fail in your practice of Dzogchen, nothing is lost. If you fail as a renunciate, you will either die or end up living a truly wretched existence. Bravery is a question of what risks you are willing to take.

Astus said:

Good point. That is another reason for recommending the Pure Land path over the path of sages (i.e. aryas). All who have faith in Amitabha and vows to be born there, will be born there. And once in Sukhavati, no more problems, and buddhahood is guaranteed.

Malcolm wrote:

No, there are problems in the pure land, such as being born inside a lotus and stuck there for 18,000,000 human years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: What is Sutra Mahamudra?

Content:

Kelwin said:

Cone, anyone, do we know of any lamas, Rinpoches, lineage holders, or realised yogis, who attribute their realisation to Sutra Mahamudra?

Malcolm wrote:

Probably not , since Karma Kagyu holds that sutra mahamudra is for people of lower capacity.

Kelwin said:

Would that be the Gompopa certified party-line?

Malcolm wrote:

It is stated by Kongtrul quite clearly in the Encyclopedia of knowledge, and was directly communicated to me by Khenpo Tsultrim Gyatso. So, I don't see how these two sources could be anymore authoritative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 7:53 PM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

Norwegian said:

Are there biographies / books on Milarepa prior to Tsangnyon, translated to English, and if so which is recommended?

Also, which of the Tsangnyon authored books on Milarepa in English are the recommended translations?

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

Peter Alan Robert's book on Rechungpa is indirectly a book on how much spin there was on Mila's bio.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 7:17 PM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

dzoki said:

The story with naked buttocks in the earlier (prior to Tsangnyon Heruka) sources happens between Milarepa and Rechungpa. Also there was no sun and moon disciple prior to Tsangnyon. Whatever his reason might have been Tsangnyon Heruka clearly altered the whole Milarepa - Rechungpa and Milarepa - Gampopa story. Older materials also mention that Milarepa had several human consorts. Again this was played down by monastic Kagyu traditions, so much so that some Kagyu lamas even claimed that Milarepa was celibate.

If we accept "12 nails" and "Clarification of Primordial wisdom" as Milarepa's texts, these are texts on mahamudra. 12 nails is a short text that specifically deals with view, practice, conduct and fruit of mahamudra. Also there are texts on mahamudra by Rechungpa for example his famous cycle on six-fold equal taste. I agree that Gampopa greatly expanded on mahamudra teachings, but based on the existence of these texts predating or independent of Gampopa's work I doubt that mahamudra practice system was his own invention. Sutra mahamudra was, but the essence mahamudra was not. Of course the attribute of the "essence" is also of Gampopa's making, but what I mean here is was not the title, but the practice system as such.

Malcolm wrote:

So therefore any text on mahamudra that does not mention the two stages proves mahamudra is an independent tradition from vajryana in general? I don't think this good reasoning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 7:08 PM

Title: Re: What is Sutra Mahamudra?

Content:

Kelwin said:

Cone, anyone, do we know of any lamas, Rinpoches, lineage holders, or realised yogis, who attribute their realisation to Sutra Mahamudra?

Malcolm wrote:

Probably not , since Karma Kagyu holds that sutra mahamudra is for people of lower capacity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 8:16 AM

Title: Re: Meet your new Chinese Overlords - From POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

DGA said:

The political and economic structure of the PRC is rotten to the core and not sustainable. Corruption, inequality, grievous pollution, political repression suitable to a paranoid and insecure regime... the CPC has made a real mess of the place, knows it, and is constantly looking over its own shoulder to ensure that no one learns the details.

History has a way of coming back around on itself. The Tibetan genocide has not been accounted for, nor is the current repression of Tibetans in China. No institution can attack Dharma and Dharma practitioners in a systematic way and expect good results. Who knows what the karmic consequences of supporting the "Shugden" scene may be.

The triumphalism over a rising China should be checked with a healthy skepticism. Yes, China is rising, but on what foundation and in what direction and to what end?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 8:14 AM

Title: Re: What is Sutra Mahamudra?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is true that people make such claims, but since the term never occurs in sutra, how can they be taken seriously?

smcj said:

I remember Brunnhölzl making the point that Gompopa's Mahamudra was based on the Uttaratantra, and therefore Buddha Nature. I don't remember if it was specific to sutra, essence, tantric, or all three.

tomamundsen said:

Lama Jampa Thaye mentioned that recently:

Lama Jampa Thaye said:

Gampopa was very learned in the Uttara-Tantra Shastra, the teaching by Maitreya to

Asanga; it is a teaching in 5 texts, but the fifth and most important of them is called the Supreme Continuity, or Uttara-Tantra Shastra. It is a text dealing with Buddha-nature. Having contemplated this teaching also, Gampopa again came to the conclusion that what was taught about in the Uttara-Tantra -as the Buddha-nature, the actual fundamental nature of our mind- and what is taught about in the Mahamudra is, in essence, one point. As he said to his disciple Pagmodrupa: "Our Mahamudra is as the Mahamudra expressed in Maitreya's Uttara-Tantra."

This is a very, very extraordinary understanding reached by Gampopa through his meditation on both the Sutra and the Tantra teachings. You see, his point was this: in the Mahamudra we can distinguish view, meditation and action –that is how it is taught in the Indian songs, in the Indian Mahamudra dohas. The view -as that which is to be realized as the nature of reality- is expressed in this way: all appearances are actually none other than mind itself, but if we look into the mind, we see that the mind's nature is just like space. It has no beginning, no end, no center, no periphery. If we look into the nature of space, we see it is none other than emptiness. In this way, appearances are mind, mind is space, and space does not go beyond emptiness. This is, for instance, how Tilopa teaches in his song about Mahamudra given at the Ganges. But Gampopa said it is exactly the same teaching that is found in the Perfection of the Wisdom Sutras [editor's note: Prajnaparamita Sutras] -particularly in the Samadhiraja Sutra- and that is found in the Uttara-Tantra. Therefore, there exists in this way a Sutra transmission of Mahamudra, known as a Mahamudra that is not just derived from the Tantras but is being presented in the Sutra tradition.

tomamundsen said:

<http://www.kibi-edu.org/teachers/jampa-thaye/lama-jampa-thaye-an-introduction-to-mahamudra/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: What is Sutra Mahamudra?

Content:

conebeckham said:

For Sutra Mahamudra, the object, and method, is the mind of luminosity free from conceptual elaboration, which is the result of conjoined Samatha/Vipassana and profound pith instructions.

Malcolm wrote:

Which of course is no different that prajñāpāramitā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Tenso said:

18th vow guarantees birth in Sukhavati. Once born in Sukhavati what else do you do

besides practice the Dharma under the guidance of Amitabha and gain Buddhahood?

Malcolm wrote:

You ought to read the rest of the vows. Just cause you are born there does not mean you stay there.

Iconodule said:

Right, you can choose to leave to rescue beings in other places. But the road to Buddhahood is irreversible.

Malcolm wrote:

The road to Buddhahood is irreversible in any case from the very first moment one conceives bodhicitta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 2:53 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Tenso said:

The main thing is that Buddhahood is certain and there's no more going back.

Malcolm wrote:

This is stated nowhere in the 48 vows.

Tenso said:

18th vow guarantees birth in Sukhavati. Once born in Sukhavati what else do you do besides practice the Dharma under the guidance of Amitabha and gain Buddhahood?

Malcolm wrote:

You ought to read the rest of the vows. Just cause you are born there does not mean you stay there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Iconodule said:

Is there something particularly awful about being born in a closed lotus? Is it horribly boring or something?

Malcolm wrote:

You can neither hear nor see Amitabha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a promise of liberation in the next life. This is simply a promise that if you have sincere faith in Amitabha and recite his name a minimum of ten times you can be born in Sukhavati in the future.

But on the other hand, other sūtras of the Sukhavati tradition indicate that you might be born in a closed lotus where you will have to remain for 500 years. But these 500 years are not an ordinary 500 human years. They are deva years. So for example, some devas live one day for every one hundred years of human life. Put in those terms, five hundred years will be 18,250,000 years.

Tenso said:

The main thing is that Buddhahood is certain and there's no more going back.

Malcolm wrote:

This is stated nowhere in the 48 vows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 2:26 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Tenso said:

Reciting nembutsu is said to guarantee liberation in the next lifetime. No need for elaborate practices, rituals, a guru or anything of that sort. What can possibly be more quicker and efficient than that?

Malcolm wrote:

In what teaching of the Buddha is this definitively stated?

Tenso said:

48 vows of Amitabha specifically the 18th primal vow in the Infinite life sutra.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a promise of liberation in the next life. This is simply a promise that if you have sincere faith in Amitabha and recite his name a minimum of ten times you can be born in Sukhavati in the future.

But on the other hand, other sūtras of the Sukhavati tradition indicate that you might be born in a closed lotus where you will have to remain for 500 years. But these 500 years are not an ordinary 500 human years. They are deva years. So for example, some devas live one day for every one hundred years of human life. Put in those terms, five hundred years will be 18,250,000 years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Tenso said:

Reciting nembutsu is said to guarantee liberation in the next lifetime. No need for elaborate practices, rituals, a guru or anything of that sort. What can possibly be more quicker and efficient than that?

Malcolm wrote:

In what teaching of the Buddha is this definitively stated?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Milarepa's accounts refer to certain Non-Human consorts.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you can ask his consort. She uses this lady to speak through these days:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

conebeckham said:

But I take some issue with the statement "No precedent in the Indian Tradition" and I think it's a bit more nuanced than that.

Malcolm wrote:

You would have to show that there was a non-Vajrayāna tradition of Mahāmudra in India, and frankly, such a tradition never existed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

RikudouSennin said:

So to actually accomplish the Two Stages of HYT one has to rely on a consort?

Malcolm wrote:

In general, it is held that one does.

RikudouSennin said:

Milarepa relied on consorts, yes or no?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

RikudouSennin said:

So why did Mila Good News not just rely on upadesha?

Malcolm wrote:

Because Marpa himself was an adept at the two stages, and passed those teachings on to Milarepa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

...not all of us are fit vessels.

Malcolm wrote:

Anyone who is interested is a fit vessel.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Iconodule said:

I'm not sure how the Vajrayana, with its intensive, lengthy, elaborate practices, rigorous asceticism, requirement of esoteric initiations and close guidance, etc. would be easier for most people than regular Mahayana.

Johnny Dangerous said:

I think part of the reason is that a sense of aesthetic or spiritual austerity (which some other teachings really rely on) is actually very difficult in this day and age for people to profit from spiritually. On the flipside, people today are already immersed in their senses whether they want to be or not, in that sense Vajrayanas' skillful use of these things fits very well with how people already (have to) live.

Also not all Vajrayana involves elaborate ritual, though that seems to be a big

component in lower tantra stuff.

Iconodule said:

I understand that the hypersensual aspect of it can be very appropriate for someone in the modern world, but to actually engage in the practices in depth requires maintaining a relationship with a teacher and a high level of commitment, both of time and effort. And I recognize that some popular practices, like chanting "om mani peme hung", are accessible to anyone and are regarded as highly meritorious, but the same can be said of many sutra Mahayana practices.

Malcolm wrote:

It all depends on how quickly you wish to achieve buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 27th, 2016 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In other words, an ineffective path is one that is long, slow, narrow and runs through treacherous countryside. An effective path is short, quick, wide and runs through easy country.

Iconodule said:

I'm not sure how the Vajrayana, with its intensive, lengthy, elaborate practices, rigorous asceticism, requirement of esoteric initiations and close guidance, etc. would be easier for most people than regular Mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it is easier to practice an hour of sadhana a day than it is to take rebirth after rebirth for eons and eons. It is even easier to practice sadhana 16 hours a day than it is to take rebirth after rebirth for eons and eons to gather the requisite accumulations needed for full buddhahood.

It is easier to have the nature of reality pointed it out by a master than it is to try and discover it on one's own. After all, look how successful we have been without a master since beginningless time in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2016 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

maybay said:

Think of it this way. In common English is it fair to say a path is effective?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, it is more effective to take the Merit Parkway to Manhattan than it is to go Rt. 95.

maybay said:

You could not say that taking the second path that takes you to Manhattan is ineffective, which is what we are debating.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, you can. For example, if you drive west on rt. 90, intending to get to Manhattan, you will never arrive there, but will arrive, eventually, in Seattle. This is like the difference between Buddhist and non-Buddhist paths.

Or it is like Rt. 95 being closed. If you try to get to Manhattan on that day, you will not arrive.

In other words, an ineffective path is one that is long, slow, narrow and runs through treacherous countryside. An effective path is short, quick, wide and runs through easy country.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2016 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

maybay said:

I don't think this is fair, and u don't see this reflected in higher teachings, which always refer to lower teachings and often suggest that they are accomplished simultaneously.

Malcolm wrote:

Higher paths accomplish results either not accomplished by lower paths — for example, the difference between arhatship and buddhahood, or the difference between common Mahāyāna buddhahood and Vajrayāna buddhahood — or accomplish a result more rapidly — for example, the difference between common Mahāyāna and uncommon Mahāyāna Secret Mantra, or the difference between outer tantras and inner tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2016 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

smcj said:

Please keep in mind that terms change dharma all the time.

Malcolm wrote:

They really don't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2016 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

maybay said:

Think of it this way. In common English is it fair to say a path is effective?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, it is more effective to take the Merit Parkway to Manhattan than it is to go Rt. 95.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2016 at 8:49 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Astus said:

[Perhaps it is not that big a surprise to say that the only people who agree with what Vajrayana presents as valid are the Vajrayana followers themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2016 at 5:15 PM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Mahamudra did not originally just mean Buddhahood in the HYT system. If you want to be "academic" or historical, you should check out the yoga tantras, etc.

BuddhaFollower said:

And when I say originally, I mean before Gampopa. Mahamudra may have had even earlier meanings.

Losal Samten said:

The term Mahamudra is found in the Lankavatara and reflects the highest form of practice according to that sutra. See van Schaik, Tibetan Zen.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the term does not occur in the Lanka or any other sutra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2016 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: Understanding the Basis

Content:

Queequeg said:

Thank you.

Can you offer some color on what is meant by wisdom, youthful vase body, and compassion in this context? I'm trying to understand through conventional meanings of those words, but youthful vase body I certainly have no idea about.

Malcolm wrote:

Pristine consciousness (wisdom) refers to one mind free from contrivances.

Youthful vase body refers to the basis before it is rent open, it also refers to the essence.

Compassion is the nirmanakāya aspect of the basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2016 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

Iconodule said:

I read somewhere that some referred to the sutra Mahamudra derisively as "Chinese Dzogchen," basically saying it was imitation Chan. Is there any grounds to that?

conebeckham said:

This is probably referring to a comment made, I think, by Sakya Pandita, to the effect that Kagyu Sutra Mahamudra appeared to be similar to, or identical to, or at least influenced by, So-called "Hashang Mahayana."

Malcolm wrote:

He was more referring to Lama Shang's Karpo Chigthub.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2016 at 4:04 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Iconodule said:

This discussion has me wondering how common Mahayanists have regarded the particular claims of the Vajrayana.?

Malcolm wrote:

They reject them. What else can they do? If they accept them, they have to sign on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2016 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In this epoch, paths of renunciation are no longer effective. But this is a standard trope in Vajrayāna, which comes from Indian Buddhism.

maybay said:

The standard trope is that renunciation doesn't lead to full enlightenment, and that Mahayana and Vajrayana are faster. How does one gauge effectiveness anyway. And even then people live in different worlds, effectively different epochs.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the standard trope is that paths of renunciation, including common Mahāyāna, are not effective in this epoch.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2016 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: healing crystals in buddhism??

Content:

kdolma said:

Also, is it better to purchase raw crystals that have not been polished, tumbled, and dyed?

Malcolm wrote:

Gems can be cut, but as I mentioned, they should be large. For example, a diamond should be 2 karats minimum.

M

Karma Dorje said:

In a medical context do the same strictures apply as for jyotish such as no pressure or heat treatment, no eye visible flaws?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2016 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: Understanding the Basis

Content:

Queequeg said:

Working my way through The Practice of Dzogchen, and came to this passage:

"In Rangshar it is said: "The primordial purity, the basis, is present [in the mode of] essence [entity], nature [character], and compassion [power]." The essence is the ceaselessness of the changeless intrinsic wisdom, and it is called the nature of "the youthful vase body". The nature is the ceaseless appearances of the five lights. The appearance of compassion are [pervasive] like the cloudless sky. These are called the nature of primordial purity as they do not fall into any extremes of dimensions or partialities."

Trying to understand these three modes of the basis.

What is the wisdom?
...the youthful vase body?
...compassion?

If I'm understanding, ignorant compassion is what sets the 12 linked chain in motion. If that's right, that strikes me as a wonderful way to cast the arising of delusion.

Malcolm wrote:

These three modes are merely three ways of talking about one thing, pristine consciousness, or as translated here, wisdom.

What happen is that at the time of the so called basis, apparent aspect of the basis, compassion, is reified as subject and object, than at that point the 12 links kick in because the knower in the basis, which is treated as separate from the basis, does not recognize its own appearances as its own state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2016 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Electronics etc. and Lung/Prana

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:
bump

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, electronics are the main cause of the epidemic of wind illnesses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2016 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Automatic thoughts

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What do you mean by habits?

zengen said:

The tendency to think certain way, act certain way etc. As if automatic, without deliberation.

Malcolm wrote:

These are called *vasana*, traces, which are a result of accumulating actions of this or that kind. For example, if you are practitioner, you accumulate traces connected to practice. These traces color how you think. For example, if you are a serious Mahāyāna practitioner and you see a yearling steer, your "habit" will be to automatically want to free that animal. But if you are a butcher, you will think about how to slaughter it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2016 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

conebeckham said:

But a nuanced reading of the dohas of Saraha, Maitripa, and others like Shavaripa, etc. indicates that there are various ways of "weighing" various types of practice, and that arguments can be made that Gampopa's innovations were not entirely without precedent.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this does not really hold water. For example, no one would argue that Virupa did not practice the two stages, and no one would argue that he taught a path devoid of them; but in his *Dohakosha*, you can find critiques of them.

One can also argue that Maitripa's texts were an attempt to normalize Vajrayāna in the context of *sūtra*, where most Indians were not practitioners of Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2016 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Automatic thoughts

Content:

zengen said:

What about habits? Do habits fall under the formation aggregate?

Malcolm wrote:

What do you mean by habits?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2016 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: Automatic thoughts

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

I don't think so personally, which is why I'm interested in the Dharmic distinction between thought and emotion, if one exists in any presentation.

Malcolm wrote:

Emotions are how we interpret sensations.

Johnny Dangerous said:

You mean "anger" for instance is an interpretation of a more "pure" sensory experience or something else?

Malcolm wrote:

Anger is the result, generally, of how we interpret unpleasant sensations.

We have mind, mental factors, and matter. Two of the skandhas, sensation and perception, are actually mental factors. But they are treated as separate aggregates from the formation aggregate because of their dominant role in keeping us in samsara.

So emotions are the judgments, the color deriving from the attachments and aversions we have towards what it is we are sensing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2016 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Illusion

Content:

pothigai said:

A 'real table' is different from an 'illusory table' in that one does not interact with the illusory table in the same way one does with the real table; one can tap on the real table or stub one's toe on it, but one cannot do this with an illusory one. One could perhaps say 'don't worry about tripping over that table, because it's an illusion,' but saying that 'all phenomena are illusions' doesn't seem to provide one with similar practical information about whether or not one could trip over said phenomena. Thus the statement that 'all phenomena are illusions' does not seem to utilise the same sense of the word 'illusion' as the table example does; In saying this one does not seem to be comparing 'all phenomena' with any real phenomenon as one does in the table example.

If all phenomena are illusions, then what would real phenomena be?

If one cannot give a meaningful description of what real phenomena would be, what are we to take a statement such as 'all phenomena are illusions' to mean?

Malcolm wrote:

One day Candrakirti was reading a book in the halls of Nalanda and absent-mindedly bumped his head against a pillar. One of his students, seeing this, remarked, "So much for all phenomena being empty."

Candra responded by passing his hand through the same pillar.

So yes, everything is absolutely equivalent to an illusion.

A geshe challenged Milarepa to a debate. He said to Milarepa, "You are a great meditator. Tell us, is space conditioned or unconditioned?"

Milarepa replied, "Why, space is conditioned of course."

The Geshe really thought he had caught Milarepa in a gross error, and replied, "How is space conditioned like this rock? The rock offers impediment, space offers no impediment."

In reply, Milarepa picked up a stick and began to beat on space, producing the sound of a drum.

So yes, everything is absolutely equivalent to an illusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 26th, 2016 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

conebeckham said:

To say that Gampopa was the first to teach ""Mahamudra" without reliance on prior practice of the two stages is pure surmise.

Malcolm wrote:

Nah, it is just a fact.

conebeckham said:

You're sure Maitripa and Saraha did not teach anyone a path separate from the two stages? Any proof?

Malcolm wrote:

Illustrious Kagyus such as Gyalwa Yanggongpa are extremely clear that Gampopa's mahāmudra arose from his own experience and has no precedent in the Indian tradition. It is a certainty for example that Milarepa did not pass on a lineage of Mahāmudra to Gampopa scrubbed of the two stages.

Other illustrious Kagyus like Kongtrul are equally clear that sūtra mahāmudra for

example is a "mahāmudra" for those who lack the capacity to practice Vajrayāna.

The best you are going to get is that there was a group of Indian masters such as Shri Simha (the Dzogchen master) who taught that the creation stage was not important. One can make an argument perhaps that Maitripa was such a later exponent, but not for Saraha, who was the master who introduced to the Cakrasamvara Tantra to the world. But this does not mean for example that they discarded the importance of empowerments, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2016 at 11:51 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Fortyeightvows said:
Why?

Karma Dorje said:
Gestation period of nine months added to the time spent in the bardo.

The Cicada said:
I don't know if most Buddhists accept this. I don't, but there's no point in arguing with those who do. Patton is as Patton does.

Malcolm wrote:
Any educated Buddhist holds this understanding. There is zero chance that Trump is the reincarnation of Patton, whatever else he may be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2016 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

conebeckham said:

To say that Gampopa was the first to teach ""Mahamudra" without reliance on prior practice of the two stages is pure surmise.

Malcolm wrote:
Nah, it is just a fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2016 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Automatic thoughts

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

This brings me to an interesting question, how are thoughts like this differentiated from actual negative volitional impulses? I know they are quite different experientially, and are easy to tell apart, but how are these things explained traditionally? Is it just clinging that makes the difference?

zengen said:

Can it be that the negative automatic thoughts spring from negative volitional impulses? It just happens in the mind so quickly we tend to think they're the same?

Johnny Dangerous said:

I don't think so personally, which is why I'm interested in the Dharmic distinction between thought and emotion, if one exists in any presentation.

Malcolm wrote:

Emotions are how we interpret sensations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2016 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

smcj said:

And you know, teachers are not good by virtue of being "Tibetan." In my experience, Tibetans don't generally get Americans at all.

...which is exactly why, if this is the problem, they are not equipped to address it. It up to us to see that it is a problem. Otherwise we are like a fly buzzing against a pane of glass and not able to understand the nature of the obstruction.

Malcolm wrote:

You might have that problem, but don't assume everyone does.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2016 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: Mipham's Shower of Blessings

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no guru yoga in lower tantra.

dzoki said:

Well, nobody was arguing about that. Though I think this is rather formalist view, as it stands now Tibetans have mixed guruyoga even into stura practices such as lojong. So who cares?

Malcolm wrote:

Lojong used to be very secret, and it is an error to consider it merely "sūtra."

dzoki said:

Of course one needs an empowerment in order to practice Vajrayana in general, even Kriya tantra practice, but since the core element of guruyoga is faith I believe this practice can be done by anyone, who is interested as long as they have intention to receive the actual empowerment later on and have already received lung and instructions.

Malcolm wrote:

Remember, there is no one in Tibet who has not received some kind of empowerment.

My observation derives from looking at the practice in the text itself. It begins with A, and ends with two A's.

dzoki said:

Also if one has sufficient faith, they can receive the actual empowerment directly from Guru Padmasambhava while doing the practice (though that is probably pretty rare I guess).

Malcolm wrote:

My point really is that if you carefully examine the text, it is the opposite of what most people imagine it to be. Most people imagine it to be some kind of outer Guru Padmasambhava practice that does not require an empowerment. I think it's real import is that it is a guru yoga practice for practicing Atiyoga: after all, the feast portion is in fact a separate text.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2016 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

smcj said:

Personally I see more people evolve spiritually through 12 step programs than I do Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a tendency for people holding hammers to see everything as a nail.

smcj said:

One big difference in their approach is the willingness to accept the idea that they won't find the answer to their problem using their own emotional/intellectual resources and willpower. In other words, a willingness to take direction from an external source and not rely on self-will. My Tibetan teachers seem to have a similar approach, and Westerners all seem to agree that's not necessary. We want to do it on my terms, on my preconditions, without giving up any of my ego territory, etc.

I submit the hypothesis that this is possibly problematic.

Just sayin'...

Malcolm wrote:

It is not problematical at all. Buddhas teach according to people's inclinations. That means that people are taught according to their proclivities.

And you know, teachers are not good by virtue of being "Tibetan." In my experience, Tibetans don't generally get Americans at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2016 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: healing crystals in buddhism??

Content:

kdolma said:

Which Tibetan Medical texts?? Thanks for replying back

Is there a certain amount/size of gem that can be worn to be considered powerful enough to have some effect? Do they have to be worn close to the heart?

Also, is it better to purchase raw crystals that have not been polished, tumbled, and dyed?

Malcolm wrote:

Gems can be cut, but as I mentioned, they should be large. For example, a diamond should be 2 karats minimum.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2016 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

smcj said:

Personally I see more people evolve spiritually through 12 step programs than I do Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a tendency for people holding hammers to see everything as a nail.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2016 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Mipham's Shower of Blessings

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no self-visualization as a deity in kriya tantra, and yet, you still need an empowerment.

As I said, Shower of Blessings is an Ati level practice, which is indicated by the mode of creation, and the completion stage of the practice. It is a guru yoga practice in which one receives the four empowerments. This indicates that it is a highest yoga tantra level practice, at minimum.

Tongnyid Dorje said:

yes, i see... my previous post was an answer from my lama, who gave me lung and instruction for this practice.

dzoki said:

I received this practice 3 times from different lamas and they all agreed that there is no need for the empowerment in order to do this practice, also my friend received it recently and his lama also told him same thing.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, if you really examine what this practice is, it is an Ati level guru yoga practice.

There is no formal empowerment for the text. But many of these kinds of guru yoga practice do not need a specific empowerment. Just a lung. Guru yoga itself exists only in HYT, etc. There is no guru yoga in lower tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2016 at 9:06 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Queequeg said:

I disagree that these discussions are without merit. I don't recall anywhere in this thread that an exclusive claim was made with the exception of Malcolm who wrote that only Vajrayana is effective.

Malcolm wrote:

In this epoch, paths of renunciation are no longer effective. But this is a standard trope in Vajrayāna, which comes from Indian Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2016 at 8:44 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Queequeg said:

There might be variations on what people mean by "provisional" leading to the confusion.

Malcolm wrote:

Provisional means valid under this circumstance, invalid under another.

Definitive means always valid in all circumstances, whether understood or not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2016 at 3:52 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All the following says is that the Buddha is reminding Śāriputra of his bodhisattva vows and giving him a prediction for full buddhahood.

Śrāvakayāna is a long route to Buddhahood, very long., etc. All these paths eventually lead to Buddhahood, they are all Buddhayānas. Why? Because they all lead to awakening. Awakening and buddhahood are to different things. The former is necessary for the latter, but paths which produce the former do not necessarily directly produce the former. But they do indirectly, since once one becomes an Arya and is free from birth in samsara, buddhahood is inevitable at some point. So from the point of view of the Indo-Tibetan Mahāyāna tradition, the ultimate goal of all paths is the same — buddhahood, hence, Ekayāna. To quote the Saddharma Pundarika directly:

Due to the skillful means of the Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyak Sambuddha, the single vehicle of buddhahood was taught as three vehicles.

This passage argues that there really aren't three vehicles at all, just one. This is consistent with the Lankāvatara Sutra which asserts that śrāvaka arhats, etc., are roused from the equipoise of cessation and placed on the bodhisattva path to attain buddhahood.

Queequeg said:

It goes further than that, explaining that the Sravakayana was more or less a delusion, and that the Sravakas have always been bodhisattvas...

I declare to thee, Śāriputra, I announce to thee, in presence of this world including the gods, Māras, and Brahmas, in presence of this people, including ascetics and Brahmins, that thou, Śāriputra, hast been by me made ripe for supreme, perfect enlightenment, in presence of twenty hundred thousand myriads of kotis of Buddhas,

and that thou, Sâriputra, hast for a long time followed my commandments. Thou, Sâriputra, art, by the counsel of the Bodhisattva, by the decree of the Bodhisattva, reborn here under my rule. Owing to the mighty will of the Bodhisattva thou, Sâriputra, hast no recollection of thy former vow to observe the (religious) course; of the counsel of the Bodhisattva, the decree of the Bodhisattva. Thou thinkest that thou hast reached final rest. I, wishing to revive and renew in thee the knowledge of thy former vow to observe the (religious) course, will reveal to the disciples the Dharmaparyaya called 'the Lotus of the True Law,' this Sûrânta, &c.

Again, Sâriputra, at a future period, after innumerable, inconceivable, immeasurable Æons, when thou shalt have learnt the true law of hundred thousand myriads of kotis of Tathâgatas, showed devotion in various ways, and achieved the present Bodhisattva-course, thou shalt become in the world a Tathâgata, &c., named Padmaprabha, endowed with science and conduct, a Sugata, a knower of the world, an unsurpassed tamer of men, a master of gods and men, a Lord Buddha...

Saying the Sravakayana leads to Buddhahood is not telling the whole story. Its when the full scope of the matter is revealed that we see the context of the three vehicles.

We're not saying much different. I think you're being a little more polite to those on the Sravakayana than the Buddha is in the Lotus. Later, the Sravakayana is compared to a phantom city conjured by the Buddha for weary travelers. Its awakening is not what its purported to be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2016 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ekayâna is saying no more and no less than that all Dharma paths have one goal, Buddhahood. It does not however comment on which of those paths is long delayed, indirect, direct, or immediate.

Queequeg said:

I think it does say a little more than that, at least in the Lotus Sutra, and how its interpreted in East Asia. Sravakayana, in itself, does not lead to Buddhahood. Neither does Pratyekabuddhayana. Even Bodhisattvayana of the Six Paramitas does not actually lead to Buddhahood... Only the Buddhayana (the actual Ekayana) leads to Buddhahood. The Ekayana, at least in the Lotus tradition, is the Direct and Sudden path.

Malcolm wrote:

Śrāvakayâna is a long route to Buddhahood, very long., etc. All these paths eventually lead to Buddhahood, they are all Buddhayânas. Why? Because they all lead to awakening. Awakening and buddhahood are to different things. The former is necessary for the latter, but paths which produce the former do not necessarily directly produce the former. But they do indirectly, since once one becomes an Arya and is free from birth in samsara, buddhahood is inevitable at some point. So from the point of view of

the Indo-Tibetan Mahāyāna tradition, the ultimate goal of all paths is the same — buddhahood, hence, Ekayāna. To quote the Saddharma Pundarika directly: Due to the skillful means of the Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyak Sambuddha, the single vehicle of buddhahood was taught as three vehicles. This passage argues that there really aren't three vehicles at all, just one. This is consistent with the Lankāvatara Sutra which asserts that śrāvaka arhats, etc., are roused from the equipoise of cessation and placed on the bodhisattva path to attain buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2016 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are people who believe that if you recite this prayer you take rebirth in this pureland, or that prayer you will take rebirth in that pureland. In reality, there are no purelands outside of your body and no buddha that can be found outside of your mind.

M

Tenso said:

This would be considered blasphemy in some PL circles.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there are people who have very external view of liberation, thinking liberation comes from somewhere outside themselves. This is an extremely provisional view. When you are a natural buddha already, one does not need to depend on some other buddha's vow to manifest that realization. You just need to seek out a guru who can introduce you to that buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2016 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow body[?]

Content:

weenid said:

To answer the question whether there's scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow body, a good counter question that Khenpo Sodargye might pose is (in the first place) whether or not Buddhism needs validation from science since it is a science in its own right.

Malcolm wrote:

If by science you simply means an area of knowledge, then I can agree.

But if by science you mean it can stand along with physics, and so on, I have to disagree.

Why? Science in the latter sense depends upon empirical validation of the perceptions of many ordinary people over time under controlled experimental conditions, slowly piecing together this and that kind of knowledge. Buddhadharma on the other hand is entirely revelatory, and is based on faith in the perception of extraordinary people whose perceptions cannot be validated by ordinary people. The validation of those perceptions necessitates that one has oneself transformed into an extraordinary person whose knowledge does not depend on the empirical validation of the perceptions of many ordinary people over time under controlled experimental conditions.

First and foremost, rainbow body is the result of what happens when you eradicate for yourself the fundamental delusion that sustains samsaric appearances. Since the outer and inner five elements are already the five lights of pristine consciousness misperceived, when that misperception is utterly removed, where one once perceived the five elements in all their diversity, one now perceives nothing but a field of light.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2016 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Iconodule said:

Right, but it's not something an uneducated or very busy person can just pick up and practice, especially if no qualified teacher is present.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct. But all the buddhas of the three times relied on a guru. Gurus really are not optional in buddhadharma.

Iconodule said:

I thought the idea was that Amitabha would be the guru once one reached the Pure Land.

Malcolm wrote:

There are people who believe that if you recite this prayer you take rebirth in this pureland, or that prayer you will take rebirth in that pureland. In reality, there are no purelands outside of your body and no buddha that can be found outside of your mind.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2016 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: Mipham's Shower of Blessings

Content:

Tongnyid Dorje said:

Not really... there is no self visualisation as a deity, so you dont need any empowerment.... but its good to have some Guru Rinpoche empowerment as a blessing for this practice...

Karma_Yeshe said:

It depends on how you define "empowerment", but since SoB is based on the view of Ati, some kind of transmission of the knowledge of Ati is indispensable.

KY

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2016 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Mipham's Shower of Blessings

Content:

Tongnyid Dorje said:

Not really... there is no self visualisation as a deity, so you dont need any empowerment.... but its good to have some Guru Rinpoche empowerment as a blessing for this practice...

Malcolm wrote:

There is no self-visualization as a deity in kriya tantra, and yet, you still need an empowerment.

As I said, Shower of Blessings is an Ati level practice, which is indicated by the mode of creation, and the completion stage of the practice. It is a guru yoga practice in which one receives the four empowerments. This indicates that it is a highest yoga tantra level practice, at minimum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 25th, 2016 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Iconodule said:

Yeah, but you need someone trained and empowered in the practice to pull it off, right?

Malcolm wrote:

One can train oneself, or otherwise, rely on a yogi who has trained.

Iconodule said:

Right, but it's not something an uneducated or very busy person can just pick up and practice, especially if no qualified teacher is present.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct. But all the buddhas of the three times relied on a guru. Gurus really are not optional in buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 24th, 2016 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Iconodule said:

And this sentiment is quite readily observable in Christianity and other religions.

tiagolps said:

The difference being that in other religions they don't believe their religion will vanish.

Iconodule said:

Some extreme protestants do seem to think the religion vanished for 1500+ years.

There's also the case of the Old Believers in Russia who have no priesthood and no sacraments, believing these things have vanished from earth due to the bishops' apostasy.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dharma will not disappear until the universe is destroyed. The idea that it will vanish after some predetermined time is a provisional teaching, like the Buddha's parinirvana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 24th, 2016 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Iconodule said:

Or nembutsu... or Nichiren's odaimoku... or...

Tenso said:

Just so you know the most popular form of practice in Vajrayana is phowa. The result of it is the same as nembutsu.

Iconodule said:

Yeah, but you need someone trained and empowered in the practice to pull it off, right?

Malcolm wrote:

One can train oneself, or otherwise, rely on a yogi who has trained.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 24th, 2016 at 8:58 PM

Title: Re: Automatic thoughts

Content:

smcj said:

You guys do realize that "automatic thoughts" are more accurately called kleshas, right? And thus this question/problem is the most basic to all Dharma. Everything else comes later.

zengen said:

But don't we produce negative thoughts because of the kleshas?

smcj said:

Negative thoughts/feelings are kleshas.

From Wiki: Kleshas (Sanskrit: kleśa; Pali: kilesa; Standard Tibetan: nyon mongs,) in Buddhism, are mental states that cloud the mind and manifest in unwholesome actions. Kleshas include states of mind such as anxiety, fear, anger, jealousy, desire, depression, etc. Contemporary translators use a variety of English words to translate the term kleshas, such as: afflictions, defilements, destructive emotions, disturbing emotions, negative emotions, mind poisons, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

No, in point of fact kleshas are mental factors, not minds. There are 26 altogether:

Six root unwholesome factors[edit]

The six root unwholesome factors (mūlakleśa) are:

Raga - attachment

Pratigha - anger

Avidya - ignorance

Māna - pride, conceit

Vicikitsa - doubt

Dṛiṣṭi - wrong view

Twenty secondary unwholesome factors[edit]

The twenty secondary unwholesome factors (upakleśa) are:

Krodha - rage, fury

Upanāha - resentment

Mrakśa - concealment, slyness-concealment

Pradāśa - spitefulness

Irshya - envy, jealousy

Mātsarya - stinginess, avarice, miserliness
Māyā - pretense, deceit
Śāṭhya - hypocrisy, dishonesty
Mada - self-inflation, mental inflation, self-satisfaction
Vihimsā - malice, hostility, cruelty, intention to harm
Āhrīkya - lack of shame, lack of conscience, shamelessness
Anapatrāpya - lack of propriety, disregard, shamelessness
Styāna - lethargy, gloominess
Auddhatya - excitement, ebullience
Āśraddhya - lack of faith, lack of trust
Kausīdya - laziness, slothfulness
Pramāda - heedlessness, carelessness, unconcern
Muṣitasmr̥tītā - forgetfulness
Asamprajanya - non-alertness, inattentiveness
Vikṣepa - distraction, desultoriness

These are things which color the mind, they are not themselves "thoughts."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 24th, 2016 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Queequeg said:

Lol. Yeah. Sometimes we need to be tricked out of the problems we thought up in the first place. From the view of Ekayana, the former, middle and latter ages depend on causes and conditions. Ekayana, on the other hand is expressed through, but not limited to certain limited particulars. I think this is a view you find in higher teachings across traditions.

Malcolm wrote:

In order to attain liberation in the degenerate age, an ordinary person needs a practice which is based on the direct perception of dharmatā, rather than intellectual analysis, mind, faith, championing one sūtra or tantra over another, renunciation and so on. I know of no other tradition that offers this kind of approach outside of Vajrayāna, and specifically, Atiyoga.

Ekayāna is saying no more and no less than that all Dharma paths have one goal, Buddhahood. It does not however comment on which of those paths is long delayed, indirect, direct, or immediate.

But if you study the nine yānas presentation one can easily ascertain which paths fall where.

Of course people have their karmic dispositions for this and that path, which is why

there are so many paths. But when it comes to liberation, one needs a path based on jñāna, not citta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 24th, 2016 at 6:13 AM

Title: Re: Automatic thoughts

Content:

smcj said:

You guys do realize that "automatic thoughts" are more accurately called kleshas, right? And thus this question/problem is the most basic to all Dharma. Everything else comes later.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they are not. Most "thoughts" are neutral and are not necessarily thoughts of desire, hatred or ignorance. At least mine aren't. Your mileage may vary.

smcj said:

Sorry. I meant "automatic thoughts" as defined in the original post, which were specifically negative. My bad.

zengen said:

How do you deal with negative thoughts that just arise spontaneously without your control?

Malcolm wrote:

It does not matter, such thoughts are like white and dark clouds in the sky. They come and they go.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 24th, 2016 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Essence of Conservatism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is, start paying K-12 teachers a decent salary, reinstitute civil studies (most schools do not have these programs any more) insist that our kids learn at least one foreign language (Spanish, Chinese, French or German) in elementary school, get rid of "new math," insist on a curriculum of reading actual books, etc.

Nicholas Weeks said:

In other words return to a more conservative approach; but this is why 'there is no practical way'. Do you think the teachers' unions in major cities and their local politicians will turn away from 'Progress' made or admit errors? No way.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Are)986ing kidding me? The list above is exactly the sort of thing that most teachers want, how/why you think teachers unions have some big effect on that is beyond me. Most teachers want those kinds of things and end up (partially because of people like you, who devalue the huge contribution they make to society) jaded and disgusted. Teacher's unions aren't perfect, but laying the lack of those things at the feet of unions is straight up ridiculous, bordering on nonsensical.

Malcolm wrote:

And dont get me started about Charter Schools...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 24th, 2016 at 5:47 AM

Title: Re: Automatic thoughts

Content:

smcj said:

You guys do realize that "automatic thoughts" are more accurately called kleshas, right? And thus this question/problem is the most basic to all Dharma. Everything else comes later.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they are not. Most "thoughts" are neutral and are not necessarily thoughts of desire, hatred or ignorance. At least mine aren't. Your milage may vary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 24th, 2016 at 5:41 AM

Title: Re: Essence of Conservatism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Not so much, it is the lack of voters educated in basic civics or even well informed ones. Suppose there is no practical way to fix that...

Malcolm wrote:

There is, start paying K-12 teachers a decent salary, reinstitute civil studies (most schools do not have these programs any more) insist that our kids learn at least one foreign language (Spanish, Chinese, French or German) in elementary school, get rid of "new math," insist on a curriculum of reading actual books, etc.

Nicholas Weeks said:

In other words return to a more conservative approach; but this is why 'there is no

practical way'. Do you think the teachers' unions in major cities and their local politicians will turn away from 'Progress' made or admit errors? No way.

Malcolm wrote:

Ummm....look at the first item on the list...."start paying K-12 teachers a decent salary."

If you pay them more, their unions will be have less influence, and pose less problems, etc. But the Republicans insist on cutting funding for all social programs, especially education, arts, and so on.

The fact that our kids are as poorly educated as they are these days is a fault I lay at the doorstep first of lazy parents, but also at the feet of the Republican efforts to slash all public funding.

I guess the basic difference between us is that I strongly believe in public funding of humanities and arts and I think it is a loss that we have decided as a society that humanities and arts have no intrinsic worth. Just look at the all the Buddhist studies programs around the world that are being cut. Denmark, Australia, whose next?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 24th, 2016 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: Essence of Conservatism

Content:

Queequeg said:

I take it you oppose Common Core... another cause in common with conservatives...

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know anything about it.

What I do know is that kids these days are leaving high school less educated than I did, with more deficits in reading skills, and so on.

We have slipped from being the best, to being something 29th in the world. The Italians have a better educational system than we do. The top five are all Asian countries, Singapore, Hong Kong, etc. Finland is #6.

Children are simply not being well educated in our country, over all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 24th, 2016 at 4:39 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Queequeg said:

The idea that there will be an age of degeneration when the True Dharma will flow is actually in the Lotus and is/was a central theme in Tiantai/Tendai thought at least through Saicho who actually celebrated the coming Degenerate Age.

zengen said:

Why did Saicho celebrate the Degenerate Age?

Queequeg said:

Because the Saddharma exclusively would spread.

So did Zhiyi and Zhanran.

If I have time I will try to gather some quotes.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course you understand that in this degenerate age, only Vajrayāna is effective....just saying....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 24th, 2016 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Essence of Conservatism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Malcolm: I basically think the primary problem with American gvt. is that not enough people participate in the system even minimally.

Not so much, it is the lack of voters educated in basic civics or even well informed ones.

Suppose there is no practical way to fix that...

Malcolm wrote:

There is, start paying K-12 teachers a decent salary, reinstitute civil studies (most schools do not have these programs any more) insist that our kids learn at least one foreign language (Spanish, Chinese, French or German) in elementary school, get rid of "new math," insist on a curriculum of reading actual books, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 24th, 2016 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: Different schools of 'mind-only'

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Around page 307 of Ven. Yin Shun's Way to Buddhahood you will find many pages on "The False Imagination Mere Consciousness System" of Arya Asanga and offshoots thereof.

Iconodule said:

As I recall, Ven Yin-Shun's position is that yogacara and tathagatagarbha philosophies are just skillful means for sugarcoating the bitter but superior pill of Madhyamaka.

Malcolm wrote:

From a sūtra perspective this may be so, but from a Vajrayāna perspective, tathāgatagarbha sūtras are definitive, the rest are provisional.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 24th, 2016 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: Essence of Conservatism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The two party system is not inherent, but it has become defacto.

Sherab Dorje said:

It was here too, with the (Stalinist) Communist Party of Greece as a third (and ineffective party) holding a steady 8-10%. And then one day...

Malcolm wrote:

There are really four parties in American politics, tracking right to left:

Social Conservatives, Fiscal Conservatives, Social Liberals, and Fiscal Liberals.

America is basically a rightwing country. This is why it has been hard to launch a Green Movement here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 24th, 2016 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Essence of Conservatism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I basically think the primary problem with American gvt. is that not enough people participate in the system even minimally. Voter turnouts so far as abysmal, only 18 % of the electorate. This is why we get abominations like the Clintons and Trump.

Sherab Dorje said:

In Greece a government cannot be considered constitutional if at least 50% of registered voters have turned up to vote. Of course they fudge the figures, but they are never that low.

One cannot strictly say that the voter turn out is what causes the Clinton-Trump phenomenon, seems to me that it is more of a vicious circle than a linear relationship.

Maybe one day you guys will grow up politically and ditch the two party (with one agenda) approach to politics. Of course that will mean that you will get both far-right

and far-left political parties in parliament, but it does break the stranglehold of entrenched political elites. Which, as far as I am concerned, is a positive development.

Malcolm wrote:

The two party system is not inherent, but it has become defacto.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2016 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: ANU cuts Tibetan & Buddhist Studies

Content:

Indrajala said:

There are various underlying reasons for dismantling the humanities. I tend to think it is mostly a result of ongoing long-term economic problems in much of the West...

Malcolm wrote:

It isn't about money. It's about priorities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2016 at 11:25 PM

Title: Re: Essence of Conservatism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Good! I often thought you were too much into 'view' or ideology, whether social, religious or political. Glad to be wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

I basically think the primary problem with American gvt. is that not enough people participate in the system even minimally. Voter turnouts so far as abysmal, only 18 % of the electorate. This is why we get abominations like the Clintons and Trump.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2016 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: Essence of Conservatism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Malcolm embracing 80% of conservative Kirk's outline means Malcolm sees much of value in Kirk's conservatism.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I read both right wing and left wing authors.

Many people here may not have read Hayek or Nozick. I have, and I respect their point of

view. Nozick's libertarianism extended to animals, for example, thus he was a vegetarian. He did not feel we had the right to eat or exploit animals. I've read Spengler, Gentile, Evola, Pound, Celine, etc., many so called "fellow travelers on the right."

I have also read Marx, Engles, etc., and I respect their efforts to free working class people from the boot of 19th century industrial exploitation. I used to have a copy of Rubin's Steal this Book, and when I was ten, I was reading Alinsky's Rules for Radicals, Weather Underground's Prairie Fire, as well as Be Here Now, first edition (where I first discovered Padmasambhava).

As a pre-teen I also read the Don Juan, Electric Koolaid Acid Test, etc.

My influences and interests are all over the map.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2016 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Different schools of 'mind-only'

Content:

Losal Samten said:

Both are eternalistic due to use of the three natures theory and its brand of emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

Better to say that all versions of yogacara are realist, rather than eternalist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2016 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

fckw said:

I find this quote quite fascinating. We all understand that he was released from evil. But what does being released from good actually mean? I assume it implies much more than simply "not having to be nice".

Malcolm wrote:

Means he has no reason to accumulate merit.

fckw said:

And this means again?

Malcolm wrote:

he was a buddha.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2016 at 10:14 PM
Title: Re: Essence of Conservatism
Content:
Nicholas Weeks said:
Dems, who love State power over individuals.

Malcolm wrote:
This is far from the truth. The reality of it is that there is an underlying ideology that has spread into both parties, the neo-liberalism of the Chicago School of Economics, and the neo-conservatism the 1990's. Clinton, proud of her conservative history, subscribes to both.

The Democratic Party of LBJ was killed by the Clintons.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2016 at 4:09 AM
Title: Re: on the essay 'clarifying the true meaning'
Content:
HandsomeMonkeyking said:
Because of the above comments it does not appear clear to me in any way.

heart said:
I understand that it isn't clear for you, I am sorry I can't resolve your doubts. I am just suggesting that maybe this topic will not become clear to you using ordinary logic, Perhaps there is something else needed to understand that book?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:
Recitation of the seven line prayer.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2016 at 4:06 AM
Title: Re: Essence of Conservatism
Content:
Nicholas Weeks said:
Being mostly self-educated I find myself of a conservative temperament mainly. But this thinker, Russell Kirk, sounds like the non-doctrinaire sort of conservative I admire (based just on a few snips from his writings). The only wrinkle is 'God' being the source of moral guidance, while true for many, Buddha's teachings are superior.

<http://www.kirkcenter.org/index.php/detail/essence-1957/>

Malcolm wrote:

If you really believe those things, I have no idea why you are Republican.

Nicholas Weeks said:

A reminder - none of us ARE Dem or Rep or Irish or any aspect of our personality.

With that aside, as a Progressive of some sort, do those principles as Kirk gives them seem likely to be embraced by you or any living Democrat?

Malcolm wrote:

(2) Variety and diversity are the characteristics of a high civilization.

(3) Justice means that every man and every woman have the right to what is their own—to the things best suited to their own nature, to the rewards of their ability and integrity, to their property and their personality.

(4) Property and freedom are inseparably connected; economic leveling is not economic progress.

(5) Power is full of danger; therefore the good state is one in which power is checked and balanced, restricted by sound constitutions and customs.

(6) The past is a great storehouse of wisdom

(7) Modern society urgently needs true community: and true community is a world away from collectivism.

(9) Men and women are not perfectible, conservatives know; and neither are political institutions.

I don't agree with American Exceptionalism, so I left out item 8, and while I certainly think there is a wisdom beyond that of ordinary mortals, I would not characterize it as "Divine."

Given that Republicans generally like enforcing conformity, pass policies that rob people of their properties and interests, try as hard as they can to undermine checks and balances in government, grossly distort the past, encourage corporate collectivism, and insist their political vision is perfect, I have no idea why a conservative would want to be a Republican.

I think you are closer to libertarian anarchism than you realize.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2016 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: Automatic thoughts

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I am under the impression that the short mantra does not need transmission (ie it originates from Sutra).

Malcolm wrote:
Whoever told you this? It certainly is not from sūtra.

Sherab Dorje said:
Vajrasekhara Sutra?

Malcolm wrote:
This is a tantra, yoga tantra class.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2016 at 3:24 AM
Title: Re: Automatic thoughts
Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
I am under the impression that the short mantra does not need transmission (ie it originates from Sutra).

Malcolm wrote:
Whoever told you this? It certainly is not from sūtra.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2016 at 2:48 AM
Title: Re: Essence of Conservatism
Content:
Nicholas Weeks said:
Being mostly self-educated I find myself of a conservative temperament mainly. But this thinker, Russell Kirk, sounds like the non-doctrinaire sort of conservative I admire (based just on a few snips from his writings). The only wrinkle is 'God' being the source of moral guidance, while true for many, Buddha's teachings are superior.

<http://www.kirkcenter.org/index.php/detail/essence-1957/>

Malcolm wrote:
If you really believe those things, I have no idea why you are Republican.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2016 at 2:34 AM
Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?
Content:
dreambow said:
"Now released from both good and evil, I have destroyed the root of karmic action and shall have no reason for action in the future. To say anymore than this would only cause weeping and laughter. What good would it do to tell you? I am an old man, leave me in

peace."

fckw said:

I find this quote quite fascinating. We all understand that he was released from evil. But what does being released from good actually mean? I assume it implies much more than simply "not having to be nice".

Malcolm wrote:

Means he has no reason to accumulate merit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 23rd, 2016 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow body[?]

Content:

weenid said:

The premise behind this thread of "scientifically satisfactory evidence for the rainbow body" needs to be questioned.

If metaphysical phenomena like rainbow bodies need science to validate it, it is just mere scientific materialism. That will mean we have already first assumed the primacy of science over metaphysical phenomenon, that everything should and can be examined by peer reviewed data and repeatable trials, if not they cannot be real or true.

Khenpo Sodargye explained about the defects of science and he briefly touched on the rainbow body here :

<http://www.khenposodargye.org/2016/02/chapter-four-defects-and-drawbacks-in-science/>

Malcolm wrote:

This factoid is easily addressed:

For instance, on May 19, 1980, in New England, USA, the sky suddenly became noticeably darker around 10 a.m. and these shrouded skies lasted the entire day.

He's confused it with Dark Day, which happened in 1780.

<http://www.history.com/news/remembering-new-englands-dark-day>

Salient facts:

It would take several decades—and several more smoke-induced “dark days”—before the forest fire theory won wide acceptance. It was finally confirmed in 2007, after researchers from the University of Missouri discovered signs of a massive, centuries-old wildfire in the Algonquin Highlands of southern Ontario. “Fire scars” in the rings of the affected trees allowed the team to date the blaze to the spring of 1780. After studying weather reports from the period, they concluded that low barometric pressure and heavy winds had most likely carried smoke into the upper atmosphere and over the

Northeast, blotting out the sun. Evidence shows that a similar phenomenon also occurred in 1881, when the haze from fires in Ontario and Michigan reduced sunlight in New England by as much as 90 percent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 22nd, 2016 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: How did Milarepa do it?

Content:

RikudouSennin said:

I haven't read his biography, but just ordered it. As of now I read just a few articles and some of his poems. I was reading a poem today and I was curious.

What was Milarepa's main practice?

Malcolm wrote:

Creation stage and completion stage.

RikudouSennin said:

I assume he practiced the two stages, what was his main deity?

Malcolm wrote:

Vajrayoginī

RikudouSennin said:

Did he practice Ati Yoga?

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 22nd, 2016 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: Mipham's Shower of Blessings

Content:

yenima said:

Does one have to have an empowerment in order to practice Mipham's Shower of Blessings? I remember, in our temple, we frequently performed the SoB Tsok, and participation was open to everyone. Are there parts of the sadhana (e.g. the daily non-Tsok practice) that can only be practiced by those who have the appropriate wangkur?

heart said:

Seems to me there is an empowerment necessary for that practice, but I never managed to find out what empowerment.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

It is actually a practice based on the view of Dzogchen, so properly speaking it would need direct introduction and a lung, and that is about all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 22nd, 2016 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Herbie said:

Some insist to argue with ignorance against insight. That's called "the world" which is based on ignorance.

Sherab Dorje said:

There is nothing insightful about your circular relativism. Boring, predictable and stupid would be more valid descriptors.

Herbie said:

Insight is not transmissible.

Malcolm wrote:

Your statement supposes you have insight.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 22nd, 2016 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: Fear or apparitions?

Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:

Is there a way to distinguish between an experience of fear and an actual suffering apparition (e.g. hungry ghost) that may benefit from the Dharma?

I ask because without fail when I get up in the middle of the night, I experience one or more "beings" in a specific room of my house as I pass the doorway.

My response thus far has been to turn my attention to a mantra (Amitabha) instead of my aversion and fear.

But if this experience is more in line with an opportunity to bring some benefit to hungry ghosts, I'd very much like to know what I could do.

It seems the mantra either cancels out my fear or drives the beings away.

I hope this doesn't sound completely loony

Malcolm wrote:

You can use the Jvalamukha practice, it is a kind of water offering for pretas. You do it in the morning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 22nd, 2016 at 4:29 AM

Title: Re: Automatic thoughts

Content:

zengen said:

Where do these thoughts come from?

Malcolm wrote:

You should investigate that and find out. It is better than getting an answer from someone here. Also, you should find out where they stay and then where they go.

Having investigated this for a while, you should go to a qualified teacher in person and share your experience with them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: blessing chords

Content:

Tigersnest said:

What was the reason for Chod practitioners ?

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a chod practitioner, you are practicing giving your body to all nonhumans, wearing protection cords, amulets, etc., is against this idea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: Single Stream of Consciousness and Rebirth

Content:

Iconodule said:

But that would mean the mind-stream can be identified as a self which would undermine the basic Buddhist critique of self.

Malcolm wrote:

A mind stream is perpetuated in grasping an I. This does not mean that I exist as more than a nominal convention for an erroneous perceptual self-organizing habit.

Iconodule said:

The critique of grasping an I is that anything that might be conceived as a self is subject to flux and dissolution, and therefore cannot be considered an abiding self. But now we're told that we each have this unique, individual mindstream which has maintained its individuality from beginningless time and which can neither break apart nor merge with another. Can you see why someone might find this confusing?

Malcolm wrote:

The "I" is the habit of grasping to the idea of self. It can take the form of grasping to something as a self, or, as it really is, merely a mental habit of thinking "I am."

That habit is not a self, does not belong to a self, and has no self, but it continually carries on imputing a self.

This habit maintains its "individuality" because its causes and conditions are unique to it, just as the causes and conditions that lead from seed to sprout are unique to that series.

This nonexistent I can be an agent of karma and a recipient of ripening of karma, even though it does not exist as such.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 7:51 PM

Title: Re: Single Stream of Consciousness and Rebirth

Content:

Anders said:

How is are emanations not a splitting of consciousness?

Also, how can a partless dharma be dependently arisen?

Malcolm wrote:

These so called emanations are manomāyakāyas, mentally emanated bodies.

The only phenomena that have parts are material phenomena. Mental phenomena are partless in this sense because they are nonphysical.

Now, a given mind, taken as a collection of consciousness and attending mental factors has parts, but when we discuss any of these in isolation, these mental factors and so on are all partless in the sense that they are simple.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 9:38 AM

Title: Re: Single Stream of Consciousness and Rebirth

Content:

Iconodule said:

I've read and heard a fair amount of Buddhist teaching, but one question I don't recall hearing an answer to is this: Between rebirths there is a single stream of consciousness, so one death leads to one rebirth in one of the six realms depending on the karmic orientation. Why does this mindstream not split up and constitute in several different births? What keeps it from merging with other mindstreams?

Astus said:

The mind stream is an attempt to explain rebirth without self. However, rebirth and karma applies only to those who are attached to the concept of self. Since a self is always unitary, there is no splitting into two selves.

Iconodule said:

But that would mean the mind-stream can be identified as a self which would undermine the basic Buddhist critique of self.

Malcolm wrote:

A mind stream is perpetuated in grasping an I. This does not mean that I exist as more than a nominal convention for an erroneous perceptual self-organizing habit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 4:46 AM

Title: Re: blessing chords

Content:

cyril said:

Does anybody know how this story actually emerged?

Physically, it was clearly not possible since JT was long dead before DK was born.

Some latter attempt to deride the Gelugpas, perhaps?

Malcolm wrote:

They are just legends, they cannot be taken literally.

cyril said:

Yes, I understand that. And that's the reason I was wandering why they particularly chose Je Tsongkhapa for a protagonist in this story.

Malcolm wrote:

They also picked Sapan. He makes fun of Pema Lingpa too, whom he actually studied with...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: blessing chords

Content:

cyril said:

Drukpa Kunley apparently tied one that was given to him by Je Tsongkhapa , on his knob

Does anybody know how this story actually emerged?

Physically, it was clearly not possible since JT was long dead before DK was born.

Some latter attempt to deride the Gelugpas, perhaps?

Malcolm wrote:

They are just legends, they cannot be taken literally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: blessing chords

Content:

Tigersnest said:

has anyone used a blessing chord on the ankles? would that help for energy disturbance? Or is it disrespectful to have it closer to the ground?

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a practitioner you do not need to wear one at all.

conebeckham said:

In fact, if one is engaged in certain practices, wearing one's mala is seen as better, and it's recommended NOT to wear cords, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, if you are a chod practitioner or receiving a healing chod, you should not wear protection cords.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: blessing chords

Content:

Tigersnest said:

has anyone used a blessing chord on the ankles? would that help for energy disturbance? Or is it disrespectful to have it closer to the ground?

Malcolm wrote:

If you are a practitioner you do not need to wear one at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Single Stream of Consciousness and Rebirth

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Do you believe all those people are emanations of Khyentse Wangpo? I don't.

Sherab Dorje said:

Well they certainly seem to believe they are, and they seem to know their shit. But what

we believe is not really the point here. How the specific phenomenon can be explained (or not) is the point here.

Malcolm wrote:

I offer them the same challenge I offered Gesar Mukpo. If they cannot clearly remember their past lives, then what kind of "nirmanakāyas" are they? Khyentse Wangpo was supposed to be a 13th stage Vajradhara.

If people wish to believe that all these incarnations are really the incarnation of JKW, ok, that is fine with me. I am not particularly convinced of this, as I am not especially convinced the tulku system is a reliable means of selecting emanations or reincarnations, etc.

A buddha's mind has no limitations, a buddha also cannot accumulate karma, suffer in samsara, etc. However, in reality, from a Dzogchen point of view, nirmanakāyas are a result of the delusions of sentient being, as Manjuśrimitra says:

Because the awakening of the sugata does not exist, his magical apparitions appear to the deluded, similar to an illusion.

Therefore, an argument can be made that all these emanations just correspond to our own delusion, nothing more, nothing less.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Meditation in Nature

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, you have clearly never been to India...

And the Himalayas??? Come on.

Queequeg said:

I've been to India. Spent six months blowing with the wind. Admittedly did not seem that much, given its size. What did I remark about the Himalayas? I've sometimes wondered if the relative lack of emphasis on the environment is that India, aside from the Himalayas, is devoid of natural wonders and dramatic landscapes.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think you have read much then. Writing about nature is integral part of Indian literary culture.

India has oceans, plains, deserts, several mountain ranges, thousands of rivers...

If you did not travel in the south, then you would not have seen much. Central India is pretty flat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Single Stream of Consciousness and Rebirth

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that in the end, the Buddha said that we are owners and heirs of our own karma.

dzogchungpa said:

IMO, the point is: What do you mean 'we', Buddha man?

Malcolm wrote:

We as individuals.

"Student, beings are owners of karmas, heirs of karmas, they have karmas as their progenitor, karmas as their kin, karmas as their homing-place. It is karmas that differentiate beings according to inferiority and superiority."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Single Stream of Consciousness and Rebirth

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Is there ultimately any unity or multiplicity in the first place? I understood these to be relative.

Malcolm wrote:

The question raised here was in reference to karma, the six realms, and bifurcated consciousnesses. This is all relative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: Single Stream of Consciousness and Rebirth

Content:

Iconodule said:

I'm not sure if I'm just not following the arguments being made here, or if my question is not really being addressed. In any case I don't feel it has. That may just be my problem. In any case, it's strange to me that a system which teaches impermanence, non-self, dependent origination, emptiness, the unreality of subject-object distinctions, etc. can still maintain that individual streams of consciousness are permanently independent, being capable of neither splitting nor merging.

gad rgyangs said:

dont confuse dogmatist fundamentalists with questions arising from critical thinking. it

will only make them angry.

Malcolm wrote:

There is critical thinking and fruitless intellectual proliferation. Sometimes it is hard to discern one from the other.

In this case, I suspect our friends question, reasonable though it is, arises from a lack of familiarity with the basic assumption of Buddhadharma. Karma is personal and only can worked out and experienced personally. The reason this happens is because mind streams are intrinsically separate and unique and have no ultimate origin.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: Single Stream of Consciousness and Rebirth

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Even low level first stage bodhisattva can have 100 emanations, or so it is said.

But an emanation is not a "split" consciousness, the subject of discussion here.

Sherab Dorje said:

Okay, I can understand that emanations of Bodhisattvas may be like puppets of the original consciousness, but what about the tulku issue I raised? Here we quite clearly have an example of a single consciousness manifesting as several samsaric form and mind combinations.

Malcolm wrote:

Do you believe all those people are emanations of Khyentse Wangpo? I don't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Single Stream of Consciousness and Rebirth

Content:

Iconodule said:

I'm not sure if I'm just not following the arguments being made here, or if my question is not really being addressed. In any case I don't feel it has. That may just be my problem. In any case, it's strange to me that a system which teaches impermanence, non-self, dependent origination, emptiness, the unreality of subject-object distinctions, etc. can still maintain that individual streams of consciousness are permanently independent, being capable of neither splitting nor merging.

Malcolm wrote:

An effect is supported on its causes and conditions. In order for a mind stream to "split" it would have to, in effect, calve itself, produce two instances of itself simultaneously.

Likewise, for merging, one consciousness would have to give up its own causes and conditions, and adopt those of another.

The point is that in the end, the Buddha said that we are owners and heirs of our own karma. If a mind stream split, then this would not be the case, the second person of the split mind stream would be an heir of karma they never produced themselves, etc.

Also, if you theorize a split in a mindstream, you are proposing a beginning to a sentient being, something which is impossible given dependent origination and its consequences.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Single Stream of Consciousness and Rebirth

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

But high level Bodhisattvas can manifest as more than one seemingly independent being/phenomenon at any point in time while maintaining their own (original) independent existence.

Malcolm wrote:

Even low level first stage bodhisattva can have 100 emanations, or so it is said.

But an emanation is not a "split" consciousness, the subject of discussion here. Iconnodule was specifically talking about being splitting into different forms for the six lokas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Meditation in Nature

Content:

Queequeg said:

I've sometimes wondered if the relative lack of emphasis on the environment is that India, aside from the Himalayas, is devoid of natural wonders and dramatic landscapes. A lot of the year, it's just HOT. The land is relatively flat and arable - good for farming, very practical, conducive to easy living and leisure (to think up some far out stuff). In contrast, China boasts some truly dramatic landscapes and awe inspiring natural phenomena. The Japanese landscape is likewise inspiring and beautiful.

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, you have clearly never been to India.

And the Himalayas??? Come on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Single Stream of Consciousness and Rebirth

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I am not citing her as an authority, I am just pointing it out to Iconodule since he brought it up and I thought he would be interested to know that.

Malcolm wrote:

Vasubandhu shows that mind streams are independent

Iconodule said:

What's his reasoning?

Malcolm wrote:

You can follow up by looking at any discussions of his twenty verses.

In order for a consciousness to split in the manner you suggest, from a Buddhist perspective this is impossible, since it leaves the undesirable consequence that one would then have to explain how karmavipaka (result of karma) from one karma would ripen on two distinct and separate conscious entities and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Transgenderism

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Oodles of news now, regarding this aspect of samsaric delusion. This blog is from folks who know or have dealt with trans people. Also stories about gender confusion and how it is handled.

<https://4thwavenow.com> A community of parents & friends skeptical of the "transgender child/teen" trend

Sherab Dorje said:

Just wondering: Are you transgender? Is that why it is an issue for you?

Malcolm wrote:

He is a conservative, that is why it is an issue for him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 12:09 AM

Title: Re: Single Stream of Consciousness and Rebirth

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Apparently Jiyu-Kennett did in fact teach that something like the splitting you describe was possible. Anyway, I have never seen an explanation of this issue that made any sense to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Many people teach strange things not in keeping with Buddhadharma, so what?

dzogchungpa said:

I am not citing her as an authority, I am just pointing it out to Iconodule since he brought it up and I thought he would be interested to know that.

Malcolm wrote:

Vasubandhu shows that mind streams are independent — that is a more reliable thing to mention. You will doubtless be invoking Jax next.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: Single Stream of Consciousness and Rebirth

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Apparently Jiyu-Kennett did in fact teach that something like the splitting you describe was possible. Anyway, I have never seen an explanation of this issue that made any sense to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Many people teach strange things not in keeping with Buddhadharma, so what?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 21st, 2016 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: Single Stream of Consciousness and Rebirth

Content:

Iconodule said:

Why not?

Malcolm wrote:

A moment of consciousness is not made of parts, as I said before. In order for a moment of consciousness to be split, it would have to be something composed of parts, as I said before.

Iconodule said:

Maybe it's my Platonist hangups, but when you say "a moment of consciousness is not made of parts," I have to ask then how it can dissipate or change into something else. If the moment can't be divided, then the stream can't really be divided into moments, in which case we have the simplicity typically reserved for eternal souls, God, and other things that aren't supposed exist in Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

"Consciousness" does not change into "something" else. This moment of consciousness is the cause for the next moment, and so on. These moments are not the same and they are not different. They are not the same, since a present cause cannot give rise to a present effect; they are not different because a past cause cannot give rise to a present effect.

As I said, it is described as a rosary of moments from sentient beinghood to buddhahood.

Iconodule said:

The problem with this analogy is, as you pointed out, that seeds and sprouts can in fact be divided into parts. So why is consciousness so special?

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally, seeds only produce a single sprout. That is the point of the analogy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Single Stream of Consciousness and Rebirth

Content:

Iconodule said:

Can you elaborate on what "production from other" is?

Losal Samten said:

<http://www.lotsawahouse.org/tibetan-masters/mipham/four-great-logical-arguments>

What I am thinking of is not a new series being produced but the same series dividing. Same thing, each series would operate independently. The 'water stream' analogy is a logical impossibility, leading to the problem of being "both the same and different".

Iconodule said:

Since rivers in the observable world do in fact split, single embryos split into twins, etc. one could hardly call it a logical impossibility. The text you linked to seems to have more to do with how these phenomena are interpreted.

Malcolm wrote:

Rivers are made of parts, so are embryos. A moment of consciousness is not made of parts, therefore, it cannot be split.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: Single Stream of Consciousness and Rebirth

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no way for a stream of consciousness to "split."

Iconodule said:

Why not?

Malcolm wrote:

A moment of consciousness is not made of parts, as I said before. In order for a moment of consciousness to be split, it would have to be something composed of parts, as I said before.

For example, a single seed will produce only a single sprout, irrespective of the other causes and conditions that support that sprout, so it is with the next moment of your consciousness. This moment will produce only a single subsequent moment of consciousness.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: Single Stream of Consciousness and Rebirth

Content:

Iconodule said:

I've read and heard a fair amount of Buddhist teaching, but one question I don't recall hearing an answer to is this: Between rebirths there is a single stream of consciousness, so one death leads to one rebirth in one of the six realms depending on the karmic orientation. Why does this mindstream not split up and constitute in several different births? What keeps it from merging with other mindstreams?

Malcolm wrote:

How can a single instant of consciousness split? It is not made of parts.

Iconodule said:

I'm not talking about an instant but the mindstream that passes from death to rebirth and which, in some Buddhist traditions, undergoes a lengthy intermediate state.

If that were not made of parts, that would imply it cannot dissolve, in which case, wouldn't it have to be considered an abiding self?

Malcolm wrote:

It is a rosary of serial moments, each moment neither the same as nor different from the preceding or the next. There is no way for a stream of consciousness to "split."

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: Single Stream of Consciousness and Rebirth

Content:

Iconodule said:

I've read and heard a fair amount of Buddhist teaching, but one question I don't recall hearing an answer to is this: Between rebirths there is a single stream of consciousness, so one death leads to one rebirth in one of the six realms depending on the karmic orientation. Why does this mindstream not split up and constitute in several different births? What keeps it from merging with other mindstreams?

Malcolm wrote:

How can a single instant of consciousness split? It is not made of parts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Meet your new Chinese Overlords - From POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Saoshun said:

One reason is democracy, allowing women to vote (and destroy civilizations) etc. [do not even comment on that, those are historical facts just do research and do not try to change this topic why women destroy civilizations - if you want argue about it create new topic]

see you in next 5-6 years I bet some of users here will be raping and killing each other in the front of war. No my wish but this is the results if you go against the nature, facts which you can not change (no free will so democracy is not possible, women destroying civilization, feminism, socialism etc)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 9:39 AM

Title: Re: Meaning of rangjung (rang byung)?

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

So essentially Nagarjuna's explanation of sunyata does not pertain to jnana -- whose emptiness is different, or rather differently approached, than the emptiness of all phenomena at the Sutrayana level, right?

Both stories aim at and succeed in revealing emptiness, but they do it differently, Nagarjuna's context being dependent origination and two truths, Vajrayana/Dzogchen focusing on what is transmitted during empowerment/direct introduction. Am I getting anywhere near?

Malcolm, would you be so kind as to correct what I wrote above, please?

Malcolm wrote:

Madhyamaka is a chronic disease...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

I agree, but part of that is that simply raising/regulating people's serotonin doesn't fix much of anything, a lot of the studies out there on psilocybin are just looking at it like a biological therapy, similar to SSRIs.

Malcolm wrote:

They are completely different animals. One gets you high and is enjoyable; the other makes you fat, turns you into an emotional zombie, and has no buzz.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Maybe, but the point is most of these studies are treating the psilocybin like an SSRI or something, studies similar to which BTW I remember reading 20 years ago.

They may be different animals, but what "researchers" (and frankly for some of these you could use that term loosely) are finding is basically that psilocybin raises/regulates serotonin in some ways, which again is not really unusual or controversial, and is done by all kinds of other things - including exercise, sex, supplements of various kinds etc..

Beyond that, stuff that is pleasurable and gives you a huge serotonin bump has it's own risks when done regularly.

I don't know why you are going off on the SSRI thing, I'm not advocating them, I'm pointing out that in most of the studies their things they are looking are related to

treating psilocybin like an antidepressant, and that misses the context entirely, because you could do it with any number of chemical or biological things that raise serotonin, and probably get similar results, especially in these small scale studies. What i'm saying is these studies rely on the same silly reductionist model of treating depression that causes your average MD to think that Zoloft will "cure" people's depression. For that reason, to me at least, they are really unconvincing.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, honestly, I think they do not really understand why they work, only that they do work, and are highly effective at what they do. The "high" is part of why they work.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 4:27 AM

Title: Re: Gradualism in Dzogchen teachings nowadays ?

Content:

newbie said:

My best guess is that it looks like a weird approach because one is not familiar to what it means to be liberated or coming close to being liberated.

Malcolm wrote:

What is a weird approach?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Saoshun said:

Keep dreaming. Chinese economy is worth \$17.6 trillion, compared to America's \$17.4 trillion. This is last 5 year before US will be attacked by china in alliance with russia and iran.

Tenso said:

India and Brazil will be a part of the coalition too. It will be between BRICS and Zionist backed NATO. The globalists/bankers are working fast to make WW3 happen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

I agree, but part of that is that simply raising/regulating people's serotonin doesn't fix much of anything, a lot of the studies out there on psilocybin are just looking at it like a biological therapy, similar to SSRIs.

Malcolm wrote:

They are completely different animals. One gets you high and is enjoyable; the other makes you fat, turns you into an emotional zombie, and has no buzz.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: Gradualism in Dzogchen teachings nowadays ?

Content:

Virgo said:

It was then I realized that the ease of khaita, the joyful easy music and movements really help to harmonize and balance ones energy. Then I understood why Rinpoche said one day that he realized that this kind of joyful dance is connected with Dzogchen. Dzogchen is about our life and we must work with our energy, that is why we do long life practice, work a little bit with astrology, medicine, and so on.

All the best,

Kevin

Karma_Yeshe said:

Sure you can use practices to harmonise your energy or you can work with astrology or medicine. But this does not mean that those things are liberating practices by themselves.

All the best to you, too!

Karma Yeshe

newbie said:

Don't need to be angry from such small issue.

Indeed one needs to know the purpose of Khaita joyful dances and there are so many times that Rinpoche insisted that I attend the webcasts.

That is why in return I insist he is a great teacher. I only had to win from him.

If you were to teach me Dzogchen or anything, I was dead and buried by now and a phowa transfer done to me that you forget about later.

And that is a great difference between his Buddha nature and your Buddha nature which of course I do not deny you having it.

I'm offtopic.

But I had to say this about treating people with respect and lack of respect.

Malcolm wrote:

???

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Yeah like I said, when something causes a big serotonin bump, it can obviously be used therapeutically for depression..really not controversial, also doesn't say there is anything particularly unique about it. There's as much or more evidence that exercise (not to mention meditation) can do the same thing AFAIK, and obviously with fewer associated risks.

Not saying yay or nay to psychedelics on an individual basis, just saying, something "treating depression" in this regard is really nothing amazing, and in fact relies mostly on the idea that "treating depression" is mostly about balance of neurotransmitters anyway. If that were true, the boom in use of SSRI's would have entirely cured the American public of their depression. Instead, they've gotten worse.

Malcolm wrote:

SSRI's don't work. And they cause people to gain weight, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Queequeg said:

Yes, write us in. Then y'all will really come to understand despotism!

Malcolm 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: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2015/12/151210181635.htm>

<http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2015/02/09/trip-treatment>

<http://www.cnn.com/2014/09/17/health/magic-mushroom-chemical-depression/>

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/may/17/magic-mushrooms-depression-psychedelic-drugs-psilocybin>

<http://www.newsweek.com/magic-mushroom-ingredient-shows-promise-treating-severe-depression-small-study-460929>

<http://www.thelancet.com/pb/assets/raw/Lancet/pdfs/S2215036616300876.pdf>

<http://www.smithsonianmag.com/ist/?next=/science-nature/could-magic-mushrooms-be-used-to-treat-anxiety-and-depression-97313121/>

Etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 1:55 AM

Title: Re: Gradualism in Dzogchen teachings nowadays ?

Content:

chimechodra said:

Yantra Yoga is a complete path, and Rinpoche's uncle Togden Ugyen Tendzin achieved Rainbow Body primarily through those practices.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he achieved rainbow body through tögal, not through yantra.

chimechodra said:

It would be a severe mistake to view any of these precious skillful means as any higher/lower/"more serious" than another.

Malcolm wrote:

Yantra is a secondary practice, ChNN himself has stated this many times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are making claims that there are subjects and objects, words and imputations, these are all your assertions, not mine.

Sherab Dorje said:

So you are proclaiming that his claim that the allegations of imputation that he is contending are an assertion?

Malcolm wrote:

Stemming from his original premise that there is a basis of imputation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

maybay said:

Well then, I have an idea what I mean by dignity, but I'm not ready to define it.

anjali said:

Ok. Don't define it, but at least say what cluster of synonyms are related to how you are thinking of dignity. For example, here is a <http://www.thesaurus.com/browse/dignity> of synonyms for dignity. Which ones seem to fit?

maybay said:

Decency, self-respect and worthiness.

anjali said:

If you are willing to look at a definition, <http://www.dictionary.com/browse/dignity> is a standard definition. On that page is a word origin for dignity: 1175-1225; Middle English dignite < Anglo-French, Old French < Latin dignitās worthiness, equivalent to dign (us) worthy + -itās -ity. What do you like/dislike about the definitions or origin?

Just trying to flesh out what it is you are trying to get at. Especially as it relates to your comment:

maybay said:

The dignity of now.

There is an inherent goodness to the present moment. You do not need to evaluate it by comparing with other possibilities. When you can accept how ordinary things are, they appear dignified.

Malcolm wrote:

Seems all very Shambhalian to me. For example:

“Dignity comes from using your inherent human resources, by doing things with your

own bare hands – on the spot, properly and beautifully. You can do that even in the worst of the worst situations, you can still make your life elegant.”
— Shambhala: The Sacred Path of the Warrior

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Is his h the Dalai Lama the incarnation of Avalokitesvara b.

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Malcolm is saying they fulfill a political need.

Iconodule said:

What I am asking is how those who still believe in the system resolve the issues that arise.

Malcolm wrote:

If you have pure vision, there is no problem. Impure vision causes all problems in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Meaning of rangjung (rang byung)?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

What about a self-arisen statue, for example? Aren't those 'things'?

Malcolm wrote:

Here, self-arisen means naturally manifesting, without being made by a person.

tomamundsen said:

Sure. However, I still don't understand how that is not what Nagarjuna was negating in line 1 of the MMK. I'm still missing something...

Malcolm wrote:

here, "self-originated Tara" does not mean that the Tara image is emerging without cause and conditions, it means that no one made it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Is his h the Dalai Lama the incarnation of Avalokitesvara b.

Content:

Iconodule said:

Is that why the Karmapas are enthroned and revered as children?

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetans depend on it. In other words, there is a serious need for tulkus in Tibetan culture. It goes back to the idea of having gods as kings. Early Tibetan kings (the first seven) were regarded as divine beings who descended on cords of light to the earth, ruled, and then reascended.

High tulkus like HHDL, Karmapa, etc., fulfill this role in a very similar way, issuing forth as divine emanations, and then withdrawing when they pass on.

Iconodule said:

Right, which would indicate that they are not recognized merely as metaphorical emanations.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, there is no law in Tibet that states you have to accept these ideas. Hence, there can be many incarnations of the same person at one time. It is not metaphorical, it is also very political, and no one much believes in the system at the highest levels, but they still continue to recognize tulkus because Tibetan lay people will not support monasteries that do not have them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 12:47 AM

Title: Re: Meaning of rangjung (rang byung)?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Confession time. I still don't understand how this jibes with Nagarjuna:

Can anyone explain this?

conebeckham said:

Sure. Wisdom is not a "thing."

tomamundsen said:

What about a self-arisen statue, for example? Aren't those 'things'?

Malcolm wrote:

Here, self-arisen means naturally manifesting, without being made by a person.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Is his h the Dalai Lama the incarnation of Avalokitesvara b.

Content:

Iconodule said:

Is that why the Karmapas are enthroned and revered as children?

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetans depend on it. In other words, there is a serious need for tulkus in Tibetan culture. It goes back to the idea of having gods as kings. Early Tibetan kings (the first seven) were regarded as divine beings who descended on cords of light to the earth, ruled, and then reascended.

High tulkus like HHDL, Karmapa, etc., fulfill this role in a very similar way, issuing forth as divine emanations, and then withdrawing when they pass on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Meaning of rangjung (rang byung)?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Depending on context, it means "arising from oneself," for example rang byung ye shes is the "self-originated pristine consciousness" because you discovered it yourself.

In most cases, the reflexive pronoun "rang" refers to things that arise from or within one's own state.

chimechodra said:

So in the case of rang byung ye shes, who is the self that is discovering ye shes at that point? Is there a separate word that would describe the "discoverer" of ye shes? Or is it simply ye shes discovering ye shes?

Is rang byung ye shes a synonym for dharmakaya? And on a somewhat related note (perhaps this is a bigger or separate question), what is the relationship between rigpa and yeshe?

Malcolm wrote:

You can say that rang byung ye shes comes from one's subjective experience of luminosity, as above.

ye shes is a quality of rig pa. Hence the term rig pa'i ye shes.

According to Kumaracandara, rang 'byung ye shes is a synonym for omniscience.

According to the the Śrīvajramālāmahāyogatantraṭīkāgambhīrārthadīpikā-nāma
So called self-originated pristine consciousness is the pristine consciousness known
for oneself that does not arise from other conditions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Meaning of rangjung (rang byung)?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Depending on context, it means "arising from oneself," for example rang byung ye shes
is the "self-originated pristine consciousness" because you discovered it yourself.

In most cases, the reflexive pronoun "rang" refers to things that arise from or within
one's own state.

Losal Samten said:

What's the difference between rang rig and so sor rang rig?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing much really. The former is a condensation for the latter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 20th, 2016 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Meaning of rangjung (rang byung)?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We can use the example from Ārya-mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti-vyākhyāna:

Here, some masters assert that "self-originated" means an entity that does not depend
on cause and conditions. However, "self-originated" means that because of arising from
oneself, it is self-originate. In uncommon parlance, others claim it means the
appearance of the kāyas and pristine consciousnesses arise to oneself.

Another definition can be found given by Viryavajra in his commentary on Cakrasamvara
Root tantra

Self-originated: since there is arising from the cause and condition of experiencing the
intrinsic luminosity of the mind, but not arising from temporary causes and conditions,
there is "self-origination."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Herbie said:

That is pretty ... well let me put it this way: there is neither one nor one's aggregates. But
consciousness nevertheless projects a self. That is called "imputation of a self".

Understand?

Malcolm wrote:

So now you are claiming there is a consciousness which is capable of making a projection?

Herbie said:

No I am not claiming anything. All merely depends on your imputation. I am existing only depending on your imputations and so do all your imputations depending on my words and my words ...

Malcolm wrote:

You are making claims that there are subjects and objects, words and imputations, these are all your assertions, not mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Meaning of rangjung (rang byung)?

Content:

chimechodra said:

Hi all,

So I've been trying to wrap my head around the meaning of rang jung lately. Anytime I'm reading Dzogchen-related material, I'm always seeing the terms "Self-existent" or "self arisen" or "spontaneously existing" (I'm assuming these are all different translations of rangjung) or what not and usually my eyes just gloss over these words, but I'm realizing I don't really have any real sense of what rang jung actually means. To my best understanding, would it be accurate to say that it connotes a sense of timelessness, of being beyond causality, beginningless/endless? If anyone could clarify the meaning of rangjung a little more, or point me towards any reading materials, provide examples/analogies/metaphors/etc. that would be really helpful. Thank you guys!!

Malcolm wrote:

Depending on context, it means "arising from oneself," for example rang byung ye shes is the "self-originated pristine consciousness" because you discovered it yourself.

In most cases, the reflexive pronoun "rang" refers to things that arise from or within one's own state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

DMT does not cause heedlessness.

AlexMcLeod said:

I wonder how one can remain mindful and hallucinate at the same time.

Malcolm wrote:

Hence the problem with samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://reset.me/study/first-ever-human-trial-finds-magic-mushrooms-beat-severe-depression/>

<http://anonhq.com/heres-why-big-pharma-lobbies-against-cannabis-legalization/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 4:22 AM

Title: Re: Loppon Tenzin Namdak's opinion

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It seems to me that this thread will go like all other threads criticizing well known teachers in the West.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: Loppon Tenzin Namdak's opinion

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

What is "material existence" to pervade in a Dzogchen context anyway though?

Malcolm wrote:

Physical entities are non-sentient, and cannot possess "rig pa." This is a position common to Dzogchen in Both Buddhism and Bon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: An interesting quote from HHST

Content:

smcj said:

You guys have balls to cop to believing in buddhas that help. That's not politically

correct here at DW.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhas help in the same way the sun shines, impartially and without any thought.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 3:23 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 said:

Fairly certain the main documentation is Jean-Luc's blog post(s) regarding the khyab rig issue.

Malcolm wrote:

My Bad, it was Dorje Pizza that was being given the smack down, not Jax (but he has the same idea...)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: Loppon Tenzin Namdak's opinion

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Its all out there on the internet, and in books openly published this and that Rinpoche.

There are really no "secrets" in Tibetan Buddhism any more.

M

BuddhaFollower said:

Are you saying there isn't any secret stuff you know that isn't translated into English already?

Malcolm wrote:

Everything is in English in terms of core "secrets." Now lets let tingzin have his thread back...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Seven Line Prayer by Ngak'chang Rinpoche

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I find that DJKR's trance version is most effective in this degenerate age, see:

<http://www.followingyourfootsteps.org/col.jsp?id=104>

Malcolm wrote:

It is not very good techno, just sayin...

dzogchungpa said:

Sigh, everyone's a critic.

Malcolm wrote:

When teachers get into techno or rap, it usually ends badly. Examples:

```
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]
```

```
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]
```

```
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]  
(satire)
```

It's even worse when students get in on the action:

```
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]
```

```
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: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Loppon Tenzin Namdak's opinion

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

It would be good if some of the senior students of TWR here decided to stand up and speak out about it, too. Otherwise we hear just the voice of the accuser, not of the defendant.

Malcolm wrote:

I am sure they are aware and choose to ignore it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: Loppon Tenzin Namdak's opinion

Content:

tingdzin said:

, Malcolm. I am not interested in started another secrecy debate. If you have internet references on the topic I asked about, those would be appreciated.

Malcolm wrote:

I think Mutsuk has actually talked about this either here or over on Vajracakra.

It is related, I am sure, to the debate over TW's treatment of the notion of "khyab rig." As you might recall, JLA slapped down Jackson Peterson hard over this issue in two or three blog posts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: Seven Line Prayer by Ngak'chang Rinpoche

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Its a little strange.

tiagolps said:

Would strange be a bad thing? CNN's version is powerful too.

Malcolm wrote:

It all depends on you. Many of these melodies come from Guru Rinpoche directly in visions. I think it is better to use a traditional version. For example, I use one Terma melody for the seven line prayer when doing Konchog Chidu, another when doing the medium Thun, another when doing the Namcho Ngondro and so on., etc.

These melodies themselves carry great blessings. It is better to use them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: Loppon Tenzin Namdak's opinion

Content:

tingdzin said:

A spinoff from another thread (the one about Orgyan Chowang's book, in the Dzogchen forum).

I too would like to hear some documentation of the claim that Lopon Tenzin Namdak disapproves of Tenzin Wangyal's books. TW has said in many of his books that he seeks approval from TN for what he writes. TW also has said repeatedly that one is not going to "get" Dzogchen from a book or a brief teaching.

Mutsuk, Jean-Luc, Dmitri, any comments?

I am not aiming to stir up trouble, or make a mountain out of a molehill. I have the greatest respect for Lopon Rinpoche, but have also found TWR's books quite to-the-point and useful, and not as open about (formerly) secret teachings as those of ma..other teachers.

Malcolm wrote:

Its all out there on the internet, and in books openly published this and that Rinpoche.

There are really no "secrets" in Tibetan Buddhism any more.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Seven Line Prayer by Ngak'chang Rinpoche

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I find that DJKR's trance version is most effective in this degenerate age, see:

<http://www.followingyourfootsteps.org/col.jsp?id=104>

Malcolm wrote:

It is not very good techno, just sayin...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Saoshun said:

When the china will be first power of the world

Malcolm wrote:

This will never happen. China just does not have the wealth, and neither does Russia.

Saoshun said:

Keep dreaming. Chinese economy is worth \$17.6 trillion, compared to America's \$17.4 trillion. This is last 5 year before US will be attacked by china in alliance with russia and iran.

Malcolm wrote:

China's wealth exists solely because we supply them with a market place for their cheap labor. But their labor costs are rising as their middle class expands, and as their middle class runs up appalling levels of consumer debt, their economy is becoming more and more unstable.

Quite frankly, China's economic growth is completely unsustainable in the long term, which is why all of China's wealthy people are leaving China.

So, we will see you back here in 2021, and see where it all stands.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 19th, 2016 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Seven Line Prayer by Ngak'chang Rinpoche

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Its a little strange.

This is more normal:

```
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: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2016 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Saoshun said:

When the china will be first power of the world

Malcolm wrote:

This will never happen. China just does not have the wealth, and neither does Russia.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2016 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: ChNN's Vajra Armour teaching

Content:

Vasana said:

Can anyone clarify for me if there is a specific melody to accompany this mantra?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2016 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: An interesting quote from HHST

Content:

smcj said:

But seriously, has anyone actually studied the last chapter of the "Uttaratantra", or even read it?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2016 at 5:30 AM

Title: Re: Is it all America's Fault? Discuss - From POTUS part 2

Content:

Queequeg said:

I think step 1 in neutralizing corporate power in the US is a constitutional amendment declaring that a corporation is not a person.

treehuggingoctopus said:

That would be a start.

Malcolm wrote:

Well. considering that the the SCOTUS has ruled again and again that they are, this is unlikely to happen anytime soon sad to say

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2016 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: An interesting quote from HHST

Content:

smcj said:

Ok, so then what is "Buddha Activity" ?

Evidently Malcolm doesn't like the subject. That tells me it must be interesting!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 18th, 2016 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: An interesting quote from HHST

Content:

smcj said:

Ok, so then what is "Buddha Activity" ?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: What to do about Daesh? (ISIS, ISIL...)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I think we need to throw Zors in their direction.

Queequeg said:

Google is referring me to zebra-horse hybrids. Whats a Zors? That looks like something Mohamed would have had an aneurysm over.

Malcolm wrote:

The term "zor" literally mean "sickle" in Tibet. It is a kind of pre-Buddhist rite used for mowing down one's enemies that has survived into Tibetan Buddhism from the pre-Buddhist period, mainly employed in the Nyingma school.

We can also sick the planetary demon Rahula (one of the Dzogchen wisdom protectors) on them:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: What to do about Daesh? (ISIS, ISIL...)

Content:

Queequeg said:

I think the borders in the region need to be redrawn. I think everyone in the region thinks this, though there is no agreement on how. Sunnis and Shi'a need to be separated.

Excellent overview and analysis of present conditions in the Middle East flowing from the rather arbitrary national borders drawn, literally in the sand, by two Europeans over

100 years ago.

<http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2016/0516/Why-100-year-old-borders-drawn-by-two-Europeans-still-define-the-Middle-East>

Malcolm wrote:

I think we need to throw Zors in their direction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at 10:50 PM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

Virgo said:

Malcolm, is it better for us to pre-order?

Kevin

I just asked because sometimes it is better for the publisher or the author.

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

I think it will be available a month earlier through wisdom directly

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Is it all America's Fault? Discuss - From POTUS part 2

Content:

Saoshun said:

Democracy = failure.

treehuggingoctopus said:

Whereas totalitarian dictatorships are a resounding success...

Saoshun said:

Democracy is totalitarian when people are dictators to the each other. And democracy is bound to be idiocracy which can be seem clearly for those who do not close their eyes to the rational matters of reality and society around.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at 9:17 PM

Title: Re: Loppon Ogyan Tanzin Rinpoche in Athens, Greece

Content:

ratna said:

Hi Greg,

Thanks for the info. I have a silly question: Do the Tröma empowerment, Ngakpa ordination, and hair empowerment come as a package, or can one take just the empowerment and still get haircuts afterwards?

R

Malcolm wrote:

Generally, you can ask to be pardoned during the skra dbang, i.e. you receive it, but you apologize for not keeping it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at 7:28 PM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It will do nothing to remove the suffering of change. One cannot do anything at all about suffering. Suffering is a result. When you are experiencing it, it is too late to do anything about it. One can prevent suffering by refraining from actions based on afflictions. That is all.

pael said:

How to avoid suffering of change? Are neutral experiences all-pervasive sufferings?

Malcolm wrote:

Non attachment

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at 6:03 AM

Title: Re: healing crystals in buddhism??

Content:

kdolma said:

Which Tibetan Medical texts?? Thanks for replying back

Malcolm wrote:

If you look in explanatory tantra of the Four Medical Tantras, you can find some

information there.

kdolma said:

Yes, I thought you were going to mention Four Medical Tantras, and asked if in case you knew some other information but I guess its quite limited..Thanks for responding though

Malcolm wrote:

Supposedly Jigme Lingpa wrote a small treatise on gems and their uses. There are other sources, but they are all in Tibetan, not translated yet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at 6:01 AM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what kind of happiness. The suffering of change is happiness.

maybay said:

The BDSM kind. Our personal favourite over here at DW.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is just a fact.

No, they are path Dharmas, therefore they are conditioned but unafflicted.

maybay said:

Traditionally you're right.

But in common parlance, and there is a place for such a thing, Bodhisattvas are long suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

That has nothing do with being on the bhumis. And, since eighth stage bodhisattvas are free from the afflictive obscuration, they have no causes for suffering at all.

Bodhisattvas with suffering belong only to the impure bhumis.

maybay said:

It is only because of their resolve that the suffering of conditioned existence is seen differently. It is not extinguished like for an Arhat.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not extinguished for arhats.

maybay said:

Of course it will.

Malcolm wrote:

It will do nothing to remove the suffering of change. One cannot do anything at all about suffering. Suffering is a result. When you are experiencing it, it is too late to do anything about it. One can prevent suffering by refraining from actions based on afflictions. That is all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at 4:44 AM

Title: Re: healing crystals in buddhism??

Content:

kdolma said:

1. But would eating crystals have negative effects on the body, since we can't digest them?

2. Where can I find this information, any Sutras?? Thanks for responding!

Malcolm wrote:

Gems need to be specially prepared in order to be used as medicine, they are generally reduced to ash.

Also some gems can be worn, and have certain benefits, for example, people with liver problems often wear turquoise. Zi stones are worn to ward off strokes. Diamonds can absorb obstacles. But they have to be large, 2 karats at least. These things are all explained in Traditional Tibetan Medical texts.

kdolma said:

Which Tibetan Medical texts?? Thanks for replying back

Malcolm wrote:

If you look in explanatory tantra of the Four Medical Tantras, you can find some information there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: healing crystals in buddhism??

Content:

kdolma said:

what would Buddha say about healing crystals?

-do they have any significance in buddhism or not?

-i think people who meditate with crystals are bogus, more like new age rather than actual buddhadharma but i dont know if there are benefits from that

-i do know that tibetans claim to wear a lot of coral and turquoise because they have some healing properties...

-any thoughts??

Malcolm wrote:

Precious Gems are the most important medicines in Buddhadharma. Their healing properties are well known. But since they are expensive, and difficult to obtain, we use herbs instead.

M

kdolma said:

1. But would eating crystals have negative effects on the body, since we can't digest them?

2. Where can I find this information, any Sutras?? Thanks for responding!

Malcolm wrote:

Gems need to be specially prepared in order to used as medicine, they are generally reduced to ash.

Also some gems can be worn, and have certain benefits, for example, people with liver problems often wear turquoise. Zi stones are worn to ward off strokes. Diamonds can absorb obstacles. But they have to be large, 2 karats at least. These things are all explained in Traditional Tibetan Medical texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

maybay said:

Well then, I have an idea what I mean by dignity, but I'm not ready to define it. Some people think it is part of a fourth turning of the wheel.

dzogchungpa said:

Perhaps it is part of what some call the <http://www.dharmaocean.org/episode-105-yana-of-life/>.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh yawn. Shambhala is a new turning of the wheel of Dharma only in Ray's febrile imagination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

pael said:

How we can be happy before enlightenment even one moment?

maybay said:

We can die without fear, or at least without regret. I would add that we can die with dignity, just as we can live with dignity, no matter what our experiences.

pael said:

Is happiness suffering?

maybay said:

No.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what kind of happiness. The suffering of change is happiness.

pael said:

Are bodhisattva bhumis suffering?

Yes.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they are path Dharmas, therefore they are conditioned but unafflicted.

pael said:

How we can avoid suffering of change?

Focus on your practice.

Malcolm wrote:

That won't help.

pael said:

How many things isn't suffering?

Only the unconditioned.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

No, as mentioned above, path Dharma are conditioned but unafflicted. Therefore, they are neither suffering nor a cause of suffering.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at 4:22 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you don't believe me, read Longchenpa. And if you don't believe him, let me remind you that according to ChNN, there is no Tibetan who is more authoritative on explaining the meaning of Dzogchen than Longchenpa.

BuddhaFollower said:

So does that mean ChNN disagrees with Khyentse Wangpo:

Malcolm wrote:

Khyentse Wangpo opines that the Gongpa Zangthel is the most profound of the Nyinthig cycles.

It means that Khyentse Wangpo thinks between the Vima Nyinthig, Khandro Nyinthig and the GZ, the last is the most profound. It has nothing to do with Longchenpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

Fa Dao said:

and that's not soul crushingly depressing, right?

Malcolm wrote:

If you understand Dzogchen teachings properly, no not at all.

Fa Dao said:

because there is nothing to be Realized or that can be?

Malcolm wrote:

When one understands Dzogchen, one understands what it means to be realized, and how to go about attaining that state. So one can relax a bit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

boda said:

A rather rude response, especially for a global moderator. Are you guys (mods) all on the same page in forum culture cultivation? It appears not. Anyway, I'm sure someone could define, classify, catalog, and analyze a great number of obstacles and find the activity quite meaningful, but don't you agree that the primary obstacle is what Herbie suggests?

Malcolm wrote:

No, since one does not need to have aggregates in order to impute a self.

Herbie said:

That is pretty ... well let me put it this way: there is neither one nor one's aggregates. But consciousness nevertheless projects a self. That is called "imputation of a self". Understand?

Malcolm wrote:

So now you are claiming there is a consciousness which is capable of making a projection?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

maybay said:

Most people are not trying to attain Buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

Most people have not even heard the word "Dharma."

newbie said:

That is because they are guided by wordly views and thus heard of impressive others, of prestige and charisma.

Malcolm wrote:

It because they do not yet have the merit to meet the Dharma, that is all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Copper Colored mountain location?

Content:

pael said:

How can you reborn at Zandok palri or get there and see Padmasambhava?

Malcolm wrote:

Recite this aspiration to Zangdog Palri.

BuddhaFollower said:

What about the Tötrengetsal mantra?

Malcolm wrote:

That will work too.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

fckw said:

What I also find interesting is the silent assumption, that there's really nobody in this forum, who actually has realized Dzogchen (e.g. rainbow body). Well, for all I know, I could actually be the only one in here who has not.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a silent assumption. If Chogyal Namkhai Norbu has said many times over the years that he has not realized Dzogchen, how is it possible that someone here has?

Fa Dao said:

and thats not soul crushingly depressing, right?

Malcolm wrote:

If you understand Dzogchen teachings properly, no not at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

maybay said:

Most people are not trying to attain Buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

Most people have not even heard the word "Dharma."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: Copper Colored mountain location?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...

Losal Samten said:

Would you give the lung for this at some point, please?

Malcolm wrote:

It is possible

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: healing crystals in buddhism??

Content:

kdolma said:

what would Buddha say about healing crystals?

-do they have any significance in buddhism or not?

-i think people who meditate with crystals are bogus, more like new age rather than actual buddhadharma but i dont know if there are benefits from that

-i do know that tibetans claim to wear a lot of coral and turquoise because they have some healing properties...

-any thoughts??

Malcolm wrote:

Precious Gems are the most important medicines in Buddhadharma. Their healing properties are well known. But since they are expensive, and difficult to obtain, we use herbs instead.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

maybay said:

Well then, I have an idea what I mean by dignity, but I'm not ready to define it. Some people think it is part of a fourth turning of the wheel. Instead of arguing against something you cannot define, join us in exploring what it could mean.

Malcolm wrote:

Don't be coy.

maybay said:

I genuinely don't have a definition for you. I'm not even sure I will ever have one, not for the scholar. Dignity is for you as a human.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess for you "dignity" means somehow to rise above the crushing mess of samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Copper Colored mountain location?

Content:

pael said:

How can you reborn at Zandok palri or get there and see Padmasambhava?

Malcolm wrote:

Recite this aspiration to Zangdog Palri.

BuddhaFollower said:

I read somewhere Guru Rinpoche kicks you out if you don't have perfect samaya.

Don't remember where.

Malcolm wrote:

I rather doubt it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

maybay said:

Well then, I have an idea what I mean by dignity, but I'm not ready to define it. Some people think it is part of a fourth turning of the wheel. Instead of arguing against something you cannot define, join us in exploring what it could mean.

Malcolm wrote:

Don't be coy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: Copper Colored mountain location?

Content:

pael said:

How can you reborn at Zandok palri or get there and see Padmasambhava?

Malcolm wrote:

Recite this aspiration to Zangdog Palri.

The Melody of the Quick Path of the Vidyādhara: The Profound Aspiration of Traveling to the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain

E ma ho:

The natural objectless dharmadhatu is free from proliferation,
the clear appearances of the essence of pristine consciousness are naturally perfected,
transformations of the varied dramatic play of union:

May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

On the island of Lanka, the terrifying rakshasa land in the southwest,
amidst many cities of flesh-eating rakshasas
is a very cold smooth lake rippled by waves:

May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

In the middle of that lake are male and female nāgas
adorned with beautiful ornaments, attractive, showing smiling faces,
with hands gesturing with devotion, and billowing clouds of the wealth of nagas:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Water birds with beautiful plumage
swim happily, give throat to song, and look from the side.
Golden fish undulate and move quickly. The crocodiles are glossy and bright:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

There in the middle is a ruby mountain,
huge, high and great, radiating brilliant light rays everywhere.
The base is the country of the nāgas, and the peak touches the realm of form:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

On its slopes dakinis perform a ganacakra at the four times,
in the overhangs are fans of kusa grass and inside of small compounds
male and female siddha vidyādhara practice samadhi:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

The peak is a vast area, beyond all measure.
The ground is made from the seven precious substances.
The surface is even like the palm of the hand, brilliant with light rays.
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Upon that is a self-originating celestial mansion
showing the four activities with stacks of rock crystal, tiger's eye,
ruby and sapphire in the four directions:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Above it, a palace of pure white crystal
is the well built, exquisite Vijaya palace;
also above it is a beautiful coral celestial temple:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Three stories, with four corners, with an outer courtyard ornamented with checkered patterns,
with jewel beams, cross pieces, and projections;
four doors in the four directions ornamented with pediments:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Filling the center is a
vast three storied canopy beautified with
sapphire, silver, the finest gold and so on:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

The roof is adorned with a shining victorious jewel-emanated vajra finial
and beautiful railings.
A variety of silk ribbons flutter:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Decorated with emanated hanging nets and half nets of
beautiful garlands of many types of gems,
small bells are rung by the fluttering hanging silk borders:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

When moved by a soft breeze small gold and silver bells,
half-moons, vajras, and fly whisks festooned with gems,
jingle with the pleasing sound of Dharma:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

The four porticos are adorned with a Dharma wheel,
a five-colored umbrella and a male and female deer,
ornamented with diamond lintels and lapis lazuli door locks:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Streamers of desirable things hang down to the foundation of the walls,
an assembly of beautiful, lovely goddesses
dance blissfully, smile charmingly and sing songs:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Like the display of Bodhisattva Samantabhadra,
billowing inconceivable clouds
of inner, outer, secret and reality offerings:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Wish-fulfilling jewels appear outside everywhere,

the tiles of the three staged border
are beautified with nets of pearl bells:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Above that, the white crystal Bodhi Stupa
radiates white light and is adorned with garlands of blue lotuses
surrounded by one thousand and two beautiful statues:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Surrounding the celestial mansion is a rainbow pavilion.
Eight great heroic dancers sing songs of power
dancing with bell-festooned bangles and the sound of drums:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Inside of the clouds of various excellent colors in the sky,
are an assembly of beautiful sons and daughters of the gods,
well formed, adorned with ornaments, beautiful to be behold:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Umbrellas, victory banners, pennants, cymbals,
vinas, flutes, lutes with melodious praise,
fragrant incense and washing water manifest in the form of musicians:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

In all directions throughout space without interruption
in the middle of the clouds of interwoven rainbows of five lights,
a cool rain of flowers float, swirl and fall:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

All scents of self-originated fragrant incense
permeate that whole buddhafiield, inside, outside and in between,
just like sap before summer growth:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Luminous without any mention of “day” or “night”,
with a sun and moon which never set,
arising without obstructions, everywhere is pervaded with light:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

A vajra fence, beautified with the seven precious substances,
is decorated with many flowers by gods.
One can never see it enough since it shines with its own radiance:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Bathing ponds, very pure and beautiful,
with rosaries of slow ripples shining with shimmering rainbow patterns,
adorned with golden swans, permeated with sweet scents:

May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

In meadows, medicine groves, and bunches of kumuda flowers
tiny bees of gold and turquoise hover and soar, collecting nectar.

Many beautiful wild animals frolic:

May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

A wish-granting tree made out of jewels

has dancing limbs and perfect leaves,

adorned with hanging strands of peals, gold and turquoise:

May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

White, yellow, red and green emanated birds

fly beautifully and eat its fruit,

melodiously proclaiming the Dharma with sweet tones:

May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Between brilliant shining ruby cliffs

rivers of stainless amrita slowly flow,

peacefully spreading out on the jeweled delta:

May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

The wind that slowly moves sands of gold,

piles up dunes of various wish-fulfilling gems,

turquoise, coral, pearl, lapis lazuli, Zi and agate:

May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

On that peak of the mountain that starts in the rakshasa country

is five colored rainbow bridge of the fortune of liberation,

lined with welcoming dakinis who bear various offerings:

May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

In the center of the celestial palace

on a self-originated jeweled throne, in the middle of a lotus of one thousand petals,

are sun and moon discs, full like the moon of the fifteenth day:

May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

In the center of a pavilion of interlaced five colored rainbow lightrays

is Orgyen Chenpo Nangsid Zilnon,

the essence of the Sugatas of the three times:

May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain

His rainbow body, the vajra body, is the union of appearance and emptiness,

with a pinkish complexion, blazing with the major and minor marks,

with all signs and meaning perfect, adorned with silks and jewels:

May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

The unimpeded lion's roar, possessing the sixty-limbed melodious voice of Brahma,
roars the sound of the Dharma, the essence of profound secret intimate instructions,
the inexpressible unceasing nature:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

The great bliss that has always been pure is the vajra mind,
possessing omniscient pristine consciousness that knows clearly and without
confusion
the unceasing phenomena of samsara and nirvana within the non-arisen vast expanse:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain

His compassionate activity is the supreme wish-fulfilling gem beyond example,
acting on behalf of any possible wish
of sentient beings pervading space:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

In his lap is his own luminosity, Samantabhadri Yeshe Tsogyal,
pinkish complexion, youthful,
delighting in intercourse with the mood of non-dual bliss:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Above and in the four directions on lotus, sun and moon seats
are the five emanated Thotrentsals in union with their consorts,
in the colors of the directions, youthful and blazing brilliantly:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

In the front ranks are the vidyādhara of India and Tibet
overwhelming samsara and nirvana with non-conceptual experience,
show peaceful, increasing, power and fierce activities:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

In the ranks to the right are panditas and translators of India and Tibet
murmuring the melodious sounds of the Dharma of speech and text
of intimate instructions of sutra, tantra, and essence tantras:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

In the ranks on the left are emanated tertons,
maintaining ascetic conduct, roaring the fearless lion's roar
of ceaseless vajra sons:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Behind him, in the expanse of squares of five lights of pristine consciousness,
are stacked volumes of the sublime Dharma of the nine vehicles,
showing their cloth labels, resounding with the intrinsic sound of the vowels and
consonants:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

On the periphery are wisdom dakinis
dancing dramatically in all sorts of beautiful ways,
tiny bells jingling:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

On the inner veranda are the assembly of brother and sister protectors awaiting
commands,
with fierce power and blazing like brilliant fire
at play in an expanse of a seething triangular ocean of blood:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

On the outer veranda are the assembly of Kinkara and Lanka couples,
the ksetrapalas, the four swift messengers, the seven mothers, the four sisters,
pisachis, shakinis, and female place guardians:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

On the second story, in the center of a pavilion of rainbow light
is Avalokiteshvara, the giver of compassion holding a lotus,
surrounded by his retinue, the play of self-appearing pristine consciousness:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

On the upper story, in a sphere of self-originated bliss,
is Samantabhadra Adinath Amitabha
demonstrating the symbolic Dharma to a retinue of rigpa's own display:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

At the four doors are the four directional kings with their messengers.
There is freedom from any causes for misfortune
because they stand guard wrathfully:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

In brief, the qualities of that buddhafiield are unimaginable.
The assembly of the three roots, buddhas and bodhisattvas
always gather there like dust in a sunbeam:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Internally, it is the buddhafiield of the great bliss of Samantabhadra,
the originally pure, naturally perfected dharmadhātu of the basis free from proliferation,
a self-originated celestial mansion possessing the supreme of all aspects:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Light rays stream out everywhere without any direction or partiality,
beautified with wisdom ornaments of forms and bindus,
a limitless array spreading out lacking center or periphery:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

In the center of that is the vase body, one's own self-originated rigpa,

Padmasambhava, who has never been the same nor different than the three kāyas,
surrounded by retinue of his own display appearing in every kind of way:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Having seen the face of the natural state of vidyā
free from any external action or effort in the state of relaxation free from activity,
empowered on the great throne of the unmoving dharmadhātu:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

As such, the non-conceptual external buddhafiield
is Sudarshana, a naturally perfected limitless array.
Through bringing sincere intense devotion to mind:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

When the time of death arrives
May no harm or suffering occur
to myself and all father and mother sentient beings :
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Pushed from behind by red winds of karma,
escorted from the front by the servants of Yamarāja,
when the breath stops and leaves this illusory body:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Without attachment to relatives, food, drink, or wealth,
tears streaming from my eyes, palms clasped together,
offering a melodious supplication over and over again:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Without fear of the deluded visions of the bardo,
may the compassion of the Vidyadhara of Orgyen, Padmasambhava,
shine forth from the natural buddhafiield, Lotus Light:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

And at that very moment, from the direction of that buddhafiield,
dancing blissful dakinis
project a rainbow bridge:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Mother Tsogyal, heroes and assembly of dakinis,
come scattering flowers, dancing to the sound of harmonious music
holding cymbals, umbrellas, and banners:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain

From smiling mouths declaring “Undistracted child of a good family,
now you are going to the Lotus Light Palace”,
physically taking one by the hand:

May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Surrounded by an assembly of heros and dakinis,
when leaving on the rainbow bridge,
having crossed it in a single instant like a trick of the eyes:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

When led before the father Guru,
through seeing his face with eyes of pure devotion,
the delighted bliss of a joyful mind arises:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

The eyes of his pleasantly smiling face are wide open,
in pleased manner he says,
“Child, you have come before me”, providing solace:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

Having emanated offerings, like the cloud of offerings emanated
by the bodhisattva Samantabhadra,
all of the assembly of gods of that land are pleased:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

The Vidyādhara are arranged in ranks,
mixed inseparably with the mind of Padmasambhava,
having mastered the throne of the dharmadhātu, enjoying the stage of a vajra holder:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

The innate form of compassion from the empty dharmadhātu,
with the dance of the net of illusion that tames all,
his omniscience provides solace to all migrating beings at the same time:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

By the blessings of the Guru, the union of the three roots,
and the undeceiving truth of the real nature of phenomena,
and by the power of my sublime pure devotion:
May I be born in the Lotus Light Palace on the Glorious Copper Colored Mountain.

This is the essence of the most profound.
When the time of death arrives,
if this is recited just once with intense faith and yearning,
without any doubt at all one will definitely be
born in the Lotus Light Palace;
what need to mention whether or not
those who recite this regularly will be reborn there?
Encouraged through the circumstances of the passing away of my nun, Tenzin Zangmo, I,
Kunzang Dechen Lingpa recited these profound words of aspiration under a overhanging
rock. May this be a cause for the liberation of all migrating beings from the ocean of

samsara and [may they] be reborn in the Palace of Lotus Light.

Translated for the Opening of the Zangdok Palri Temple by Acharya Malcolm Smith,
11/25/09

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

maybay said:

Well we're not going to get anywhere like this. Did I say you would find dignity in samsara?
How about you start with what you think dignity means and we'll go from there.

Malcolm wrote:

How about you define what you mean by "dignity," since you introduced the concept into this discussion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

newbie said:

You ascertain there is no dignity, and I say there is.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no dignity in samsara. What is samsara? Samsara is the three kinds of suffering.

What are the three kinds of suffering? The suffering of suffering, the suffering of change and the all-pervasive suffering.

There is no dignity in suffering, there is no dignity in ignorance. Ignorance is the cause of samsara and the cause of suffering.

As Maitreya states, there isn't even the head of a pin of happiness in samsara. What room could there be for dignity?

maybay said:

There's room for Maitreya.

Malcolm wrote:

Maitreya is free from the suffering of samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

newbie said:

You ascertain there is no dignity, and I say there is.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no dignity in samsara. What is samsara? Samsara is the three kinds of suffering.

What are the three kinds of suffering? The suffering of suffering, the suffering of change and the all-pervasive suffering.

There is no dignity in suffering, there is no dignity in ignorance. Ignorance is the cause of samsara and the cause of suffering.

As Maitreya states, there isn't even the head of a pin of happiness in samsara. What room could there be for dignity?

newbie said:

Then because of ignorance, we request the turn of wheel of dharma and we supplicate the Buddha-s not to pass into nirvana.

Malcolm wrote:

That does not mean there is dignity in samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 4:15 AM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That is just a lot of conceptuality.

Astus said:

What isn't?

Anyone can see buddhanature, they just have to have the method.

E.g. "zazen is entering directly into the ocean of buddha-nature and manifesting the body of the Buddha" (<http://antaiji.org/en/classics/english-zazen-yojinki/>)

Malcolm wrote:

That's not what I am talking about.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: is Buddhism a religious faith?

Content:

AlexMcLeod said:

If it is truly the Ultimate, it is immune because the Ultimate beyond description or analysis.

Astus said:

What makes something the ultimate?

AlexMcLeod said:

Ultimate is merely a shorthand term some people use for Ultimate Reality. Or True Nature, or I've heard a bunch of other colorful phrases people use to describe it.

Malcolm wrote:

The term "ultimate" simply means an object of an undeceived cognition, for example, the direct perception of emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

newbie said:

No, this is wrong. We do prostrations to cut down pride, not dignity.

Malcolm wrote:

What does this have to do with my statement?

newbie said:

You ascertain there is no dignity, and I say there is.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no dignity in samsara. What is samsara? Samsara is the three kinds of suffering.

What are the three kinds of suffering? The suffering of suffering, the suffering of change and the all-pervasive suffering.

There is no dignity in suffering, there is no dignity in ignorance. Ignorance is the cause of samsara and the cause of suffering.

As Maitreya states, there isn't even the head of a pin of happiness in samsara. What room could there be for dignity?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

maybay said:

The noble truth of suffering. It's your choice.

Malcolm wrote:

The truth of suffering per se, isn't "noble." This is a persistent mistranslation. It is the "Āryas' truth of suffering," in other words, āryas see the truth of suffering.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

newbie said:

No, this is wrong. We do prostrations to cut down pride, not dignity.

Malcolm wrote:

What does this have to do with my statement?

maybay said:

If Buddhahood is inevitable (men and women), and there is no place for provisional teachings, then whatever humiliation comes your way must surely be dignified. But then we should call it humbleness, the temperance of pride.

Malcolm wrote:

Who said there was no place for provisional teachings?

But in general, what kind of dignity can be found in the three kinds of suffering. The nobility or dignity of suffering is an entirely Christian idea. I don't see that it has much place in Buddhadharma. For example, apart from Trungpa's scene, where they waffle on a lot about "dignity," I don't see any references to "dignity" with respect to samsara the sūtras and tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

fckw said:

What I also find interesting is the silent assumption, that there's really nobody in this forum, who actually has realized Dzogchen (e.g. rainbow body). Well, for all I know, I could actually be the only one in here who has not.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a silent assumption. If Chogyal Namkhai Norbu has said many times over the years that he has not realized Dzogchen, how is it possible that someone here has?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

newbie said:

No, this is wrong. We do prostrations to cut down pride, not dignity.

Malcolm wrote:

What does this have to do with my statement?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

Astus said:

The buddha-nature is already perfect with all the qualities of buddhahood. The reason buddha-nature is not seen is grasping appearances. Once that mistaken identification is gone, the buddha-mind can manifest.

Malcolm wrote:

That is just a lot of conceptuality.

Anyone can see buddhanature, they just have to have the method.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

maybay said:

Suppose instead of non-suffering, or truth, the benchmark was dignity. Then we would have space for a modicum of pain, and we would neither beat ourselves up with truths nor barricade ourselves away from every possible harm. There would be topics of discussion we could conscionably ignore, and we would neither prattle on about trivialities nor grow ego-maniacal about acquiring knowledge. Conflicts would not be avoided outright, but weighed up as either dignified or undignified. The elderly would be respected. What had been turned over would be made upright. What balance we could achieve between study, contemplation and meditation. From the island of Dharma

would beam the lighthouse of dignity, guiding us through the tumultuous ocean of uncertainty. We would never lose sight of what is most important. What balance we could achieve between our mundane and our spiritual efforts!

Malcolm wrote:

There is no dignity in samsara, none whatsoever. It is basically just an exercise in constant humiliation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I would say that is the essence of the Hinayāna path. But the Mahāyāna path also includes the attainment of omniscience.

Astus said:

What is the reason for attaining omniscience? Isn't it to liberate all beings from suffering?

Malcolm wrote:

You can say that.

However, the point is that the Buddha's path is not only about freedom from negative qualities. It is also about the attainment of positive qualities, such as the four fearlessness, the eighteen unshared qualities of a Buddha and so on.

So while it is true that the motive for the attainment of these positive qualities is in order to liberate other sentient beings, they are also positive in their own right, apart from that motivation.

The negative view of awakening that you consistently portray also shortens one's lifespan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 16th, 2016 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

Wayfarer said:

As always, I disagree.

Astus said:

What do you say about the purpose of the Buddha's teachings as being for liberation from suffering?

Malcolm wrote:

I would say that is the essence of the Hinayāna path. But the Mahāyāna path also includes the attainment of omniscience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2016 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Saga Dawa 2016

Content:

paël said:

Can you take them if you need to eat after noon? I can't fast due to health.

Malcolm wrote:

Better to take and break than not to take. Anyway, if it is a health issue, than there is no breakage. Evening meal is medicine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2016 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

Astus said:

I see a general tendency to search for the truth, to argue about the truth, to consider the truth as the final goal and measure in Buddhism. But what if we change that yardstick to pain, suffering, dissatisfaction and the lack of it? One can consult scriptures and teachers to decide what is orthodox and canonical in terms of doctrine and method. However, if the standard is one's own pain or peace, what is there to compare?

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry Astus, but this is silliness. As the Buddha states in the Lalitavistara Sūtra:

I obtained the ambrosial Dharma—

profound, peaceful, free from dust, luminous, and unconditioned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2016 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Inside the Bathroom Movement

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

From a Buddhist point of view...

Losal Samten said:

Do you know if being trans, pandaka, or intersex makes any difference to the path in their present lifetime?

Malcolm wrote:

Apart from being ineligible for monastic ordination, I don't really seen any. Some

Vajrayāna practitioners may argue that gender reassignment surgery creates a lot of disruption in the channels and cakras, but since most Vajrayāna people attain liberation in the bardo, I hardly see how gender reassignment surgery really matters at all in this respect.

Basically, no matter what our opinions about this issue may be, it is not our job to sit in judgement of what other people do with their bodies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2016 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Inside the Bathroom Movement

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

While I understand the language correction of 'transwoman' or the contrary to what Justsit thinks is proper; I will stay with my choice. I prefer trans guy to mean a male sex human who transitions to the other gender. Same notion for trans girl.

So I prefer the emphasis on the basis, Justsit prefers the effect.

Malcolm wrote:

From a Buddhist point of view, physical gender is unalterable (apart from the third week of pregnancy, where there are things one can do to change the gender of a child). Whether you have a penis removed or attached, it has no bearing on your actual gender.

It is interesting to note that there was at one time a lot of pushback from women's festivals over the issue of transwomen. If anyone has seen the show Transparent on Amazon, there is treatment of this issue on that show, there is still some pushback, but in general, it seems that younger women are more accepting of transwomen than older women.

Still, there are key experiences, embodied experiences, that transwomen will never undergo such as developing breasts at puberty, menstruation, pregnancy, and so on. The same holds true for transmen.

Thus, while one may be able to change one's appearance, changing one's gender is impossible. Gender assignment is a function of karma, not surgery.

Despite this, I see no real reason to make such a big issue out of trans people using the bathroom of their choice.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2016 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: Considering lung as empowerment?

Content:

pael said:

Do you get power to do mantra, if you do not repeat after teacher? I was unsure what was going on. I was too confused to repeat after him. Did I still get mantras? Do a ritual entail daily mantra repetition? I wasn't whole lecture there. I had to leave earlier. So, I don't know if there was any commitments.

Malcolm wrote:

You can still recite. There will be no daily commitment, per se.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2016 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Herbie said:

The only obstacle as deep seated belief is the view of a inherently existing self depending on the transitory aggregates.

Queequeg said:

An answer like that suggests you are either enlightened or you're a parrot and have no idea what you're talking about. Just sayin.

boda said:

A rather rude response, especially for a global moderator. Are you guys (mods) all on the same page in forum culture cultivation? It appears not. Anyway, I'm sure someone could define, classify, catalog, and analyze a great number of obstacles and find the activity quite meaningful, but don't you agree that the primary obstacle is what Herbie suggests?

Malcolm wrote:

No, since one does not need to have aggregates in order to impute a self.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2016 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Copper Colored mountain location?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

While there are of course, inner and secret presentations of "where" Zangdog Palri is, the late master, Lodö Gyatsho (1930—2002) states:

In the past eon, when Hayagriva and Vajravārāhi liberated Rudra, among the eight substances blessed as the eight places which are sources of Secret Mantra, if it is asked which substance, the place where his sexual organ fell is a special place for the

dependent origination of the unsurpassed secret. Further, the shape of the island resembles a scapula with the short edge facing north. It is maroon in color, as if it were copper in all directions. All of the mountains stand up like weapons. There are very deep ravines, and all the trees bear thorns. All the rivers are disturbed by waves, during the day the whole place has wind storms, and at night blazes with fire. It then goes on to describe how it is surrounded by eight islands, each with one of the eight manifestations of Padmasambhava giving teachings, and so on.

FYI: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Madagascar_spiny_forests

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2016 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Considering lung as empowerment?

Content:

paël said:

I were in lecture of Geshe Dakpa Gyaltsen. In his lecture he told us to repeat mantra while visualizing deity above head and his translator called it empowerment. There was not any ceremony or vase. Is it then empowerment? Or lung?

Malcolm wrote:

This is called a rig gtad, an entrustment of knowledge, it is a system from kriya tantra, and is not an empowerment. It is a way of bestowing a mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 15th, 2016 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Is the nature of mind a fiction?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We need to not only identify the crime, and the criminal, we need to do something more. We need to discover what the criminal was trying to steal and why. We need a motive, in other words.

BuddhaFollower said:

Perceiving the Five Wisdom Lights as being "other" to oneself?

Malcolm wrote:

That's part of it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Is the nature of mind a fiction?

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Just recognize the conceptualizing mind.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, this is not enough, you also need to recognize pristine consciousness, aka, ye shes.

BuddhaFollower said:

What method do you use for that?

T*g*l?

Malcolm wrote:

First you have to distinguish the mind from nature of the mind. For example, your statement, "Just recognize the conceptualizing mind" is just an APB, it is only interested in finding a criminal. So once you have the criminal in custody, then what do you do?

We need to not only identify the crime, and the criminal, we need to do something more. We need to discover what the criminal was trying to steal and why. We need a motive, in other words.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Lhasa said:

Malcolm, would you please expand on exactly how to supplicate the guru?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, there are so many ways. But they all involve reciting heartfelt supplications such as Barche Lamsel, and so on, reciting one's guru's name mantra, the vajra guru mantra.

BTW, Dzogchungpa, were anyone was daft enough to recite it, my mantra would be Om aḥ hūṃ guru vimuktenanda siddhi hūṃ.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Is the nature of mind a fiction?

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Just recognize the conceptualizing mind.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, this is not enough, you also need to recognize pristine consciousness, aka, ye shes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 9:24 PM

Title: Re: Is the nature of mind a fiction?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

These things in general come from Taoism. In the end, they are based on a view of the human body somewhat outside the view of the Human body as it is understood in the Tantras.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Buddhist and Taoist Qigong are different, but with years of interplay. Believe it or not I know what the channels are and how they functions in Tantra in regards to liberation etc..at least in a general sense, so I get what you are saying. They are different though, abdominal breathing for instance is usually associated with Buddhist systems, and reverse abdominal breathing with Daoist. Neiija is usually said to be Daoist, Waiija Buddhist.

Malcolm wrote:

These are martial arts ideas, grounded in the system of Chinese Medicine.

Johnny Dangerous said:

There are other important differences as well that you would really have to study Secret Mantra in a serious way to properly understand.

I like to think that at least sometimes I study "in a serious way". I'm not saying the Chinese had the same concepts as in Tantra, but the fact that they had processes which involved gathering into the central channel and expelling from the crown makes me think it might not have been that far off, and that the more substantialist ideas about the subtle body you are talking about got grafted on from Taoism, just speculation of course.. That said, I know there is also a theory that some of it (Chinese Buddhist Qigong) came from Tibet in the first place.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, this issue has to do with how the path is understood in relation to the human body. It has nothing to do with "energy," meridians, breathing, and so on.

Johnny Dangerous said:

I'm not saying that at all ,just saying - Chinese Buddhism definitely has something

similar in terms of practices with the subtle body and anatomy, or did.. whether you want to point out specific differences or not.

Malcolm wrote:

Hinduism also has these things, but because Hindu notions of cakras and so on do not correspond to the path, we don't make use of them and they are not part of our tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 9:15 PM

Title: Re: Is the nature of mind a fiction?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It would be an error to state that awakening in Chan and Dzogchen and Mahamudra were different, for they are not. But the path of Chan, Mahamudra, and Dzogchen are very different, and it is a grave error to conflate them.

Temicco said:

I think I really misunderstood what was going on earlier in this thread, then. What did you mean when you said that Vajrayana describes the mind-essence differently?

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on which system we are discussing, Mahāmudra or Dzogchen.

In general, in Chan we do not find any descriptions of the mind essence one would not also find in the sūtras, such attributes as luminosity, etc., are all to be found in the sūtra division. Also, there is the notion that buddhahood is to be found in the mind.

Mahāmudra, and here we are referring to Mahāmudra as it is practiced mainly the Karma Kagyu school, is divided up into three kinds, sūtra, "tantric" and essence. The first of these is based on a gradual system of pointing out done in conjunction with sessions of practice. The second of these is based on the experience of empowerment combined with yogic practices which rapidly induce samadhi, and the third of these systems is based on a kind of blessing empowerment and does not have any practice other than guru devotion. Of these three, the first is most like Chan, in that while it is gradual, it also includes the idea of sudden awakening. In all, the practice is based on understanding that mind as inseparable clarity and emptiness as the basis for the three kāyas. Clarity and luminosity are not the same thing (though the term *gsal ba*, clarity, can be used as a gloss for 'od *gsal*, luminosity"), the former term refers to mind's open lit-up space in which appearances rise and subside — some people like to translate clarity as "cognizance." In sūtra and Chan "luminosity" refers to the mind's essential purity.

In Dzogchen on the other hand, mind is strictly a product of a process of delusion. While the mind-essence is also inseparable clarity and emptiness, mind itself is the result of ignorance about its own state. Thus mind is always with concepts and is always deluded, mind-essence is always nonconceptual and undeluded.

The reason why the awakening of all three systems is the same is that all realize the same emptiness. But there are distinct differences in path and praxis based on how the mind-essence is understood and how the human body plays a role in awakening (Note, I did not say that buddhahood offered by all three systems is the same, just the awakening (there is one level of Buddhahood in Chan, three in Mahāmudra and six in Dzogchen.) In Chan, apart from posture, there is basically no role for the human body in terms of awakening. This also true in Sūtra Mahāmudra, where the practice based on a gradual approach to śamatha and vipaśyāna, combined with oral instructions from the siddhas.

In Dzogchen, the practice is based on the human body from beginning to end, like other Vajrayāna systems. While there are many differences between Dzogchen and other Vajrayāna systems, one of the most salient is Dzogchen is not a path of renunciation, nor is it a path of transformation. It is a path of self-liberation. How that self-liberation is understood is a direct consequence of how it deals with the issue of mind essence.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 9:53 AM

Title: Re: Is the nature of mind a fiction?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...no practice based on the anatomy of the human body, etc.

Johnny Dangerous said:

I don't know if they are specifically things that are currently taught in Chan, but there are certainly Chinese Buddhist practices working with the subtle body. In fact some of them on a basic level are pretty similar to tsa lung/tummo, and have a goal of phowa, essentially.

Malcolm wrote:

These things in general come from Taoism. In the end, they are based on a view of the human body somewhat outside the view of the Human body as it is understood in the Tantras. There are other important differences as well that you would really have to study Secret Mantra in a serious way to properly understand.

It would be an error to state that awakening in Chan and Dzogchen and Mahamudra were different, for they are not. But the path of Chan, Mahamudra, and Dzogchen are very different, and it is a grave error to conflate them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 5:28 AM

Title: Re: Is the nature of mind a fiction?

Content:

Temicco said:

It's not that I've decided that, it's that I've seen no compelling case to the contrary from anyone approaching Chan by its own terms. Chan does not consider itself Sutrayana, for instance. And did Tibet even know about and address Southern Chan teachings until recently?

Malcolm wrote:

Chan is Sūtra because it is not Vajrayāna, plain and simple. It has no method of empowerment, no method of direct introduction, no practice based on the anatomy of the human body, etc.

There are no methods in Chan not taught in sūtras. Chan is basically prajñāpāramitā in theory and approach, using the sudden approach taught in the Lankāvatara Sūtra. This is why I call Chan sūtra-based, not because there is some sūtra that Chan follows.

But its ok, you asked a question, I endeavored to answer it. It is pretty clear to me when I talk to Zen folks that their practice is very different than what we do. I also have a student who practiced for 35 years under Maizumi Roshi and his successors. She is pretty clear on how Zen, including koans, and Dzogchen, etc. are different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: Is the nature of mind a fiction?

Content:

Temicco said:

The program may differ, but I see no evidence that the instruction is different in essence. Sure, in Vajrayana you are dependent upon the guru, but the nature of mind can be and is pointed out by a teacher in both traditions. The only thing with Chan is that it doesn't have to be.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure there is a difference, Chan is focused primarily on emptiness, this is what is considered the "nature of the mind" in Chan.

In Vajrayāna, the mind-essence is not only emptiness.

Temicco said:

According to who is that the Chan account of the nature of mind?

In the classical Chan texts I've read, no clear distinction is made between the mind and

its nature. The mind is described as dynamic, miraculously aware, luminous, unborn, and blissful, and all changing appearances perceived are no different from the mind. It's not as simple saying that its nature is empty, I don't think.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, well, you continue to believe what you like. You seem to have decided what is true and what is not. Since you have decided there is no difference between Chan, Dzogchen and Mahāmudra, there is no reason for you to pursue the latter two.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Is the nature of mind a fiction?

Content:

Temicco said:

The program may differ, but I see no evidence that the instruction is different in essence. Sure, in Vajrayana you are dependent upon the guru, but the nature of mind can be and is pointed out by a teacher in both traditions. The only thing with Chan is that it doesn't have to be.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure there is a difference, Chan is focused primarily on emptiness, this is what is considered the "nature of the mind" in Chan.

In Vajrayāna, the mind-essence is not only emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Is the nature of mind a fiction?

Content:

Temicco said:

It's never called "direct introduction", but I think it would be a bit silly to think that what's going on in Tibetan ngo sprod is any different from what's going on in some of the gong-ans. The same words (well, in translation at least) are even used at times -- "just this". Does it really matter that Chan didn't reify this into a method?

Malcolm wrote:

Again, the difference is that in direct introduction you are introduced to the mind-essence immediately, it is not something you need to go out and discover on your own or search for.

In Chan, there is no discussion of direct introduction, or even hint of it, because Chan is a path which is not based on Secret Mantra. So the approach is completely different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: Is the nature of mind a fiction?

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Just recognize the conceptualizing mind.

Malcolm wrote:

That is good, but it is not enough.

BuddhaFollower said:

Why not?

Malcolm wrote:

Because that is not all there is to recognize.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Is the nature of mind a fiction?

Content:

Temicco said:

I figured you were talking about the nature of mind as an object of experience, which wouldn't exactly be the Chan stance.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, correct. In Chan there is no direct introduction to the nature of the mind as an object of experience. In Dzogchen and Mahāmudra, there is.

This has nothing to do with polemics, and everything to do with the difference between Sūtra and Secret Mantra.

Temicco said:

I suspect we might be talking about different kinds of experience. Huangbo talks extensively about how the Buddha and the Patriarchs pointed out the nature of mind. He also says that "if one recognizes one's own Mind and sees one's own Nature, there is nothing at all to seek outside oneself". The nature of mind can clearly also be talked about as something experienced. So it's not as simple as I formulated it.

Malcolm wrote:

Is it introduced in the beginning as an experience? Or is something one must discover on one's own?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 2:22 AM

Title: Re: Is the nature of mind a fiction?

Content:

Temicco said:

You're not being very clear. Chan is all about the nature of mind. In what way do you propose it differs from the latter two?

Malcolm wrote:

I was being very clear. In Chan there is no experiential introduction to the nature of the mind. In Mahāmudra and Dzogchen there is. That is the difference. There are other differences as well, but we do not need to discuss them.

Temicco said:

I figured you were talking about the nature of mind as an object of experience, which wouldn't exactly be the Chan stance.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, correct. In Chan there is no direct introduction to the nature of the mind as an object of experience. In Dzogchen and Mahāmudra, there is.

This has nothing to do with polemics, and everything to do with the difference between Sūtra and Secret Mantra.

Temicco said:

But it still talks of "seeing your nature and becoming a Buddha". There's definitely experiential introduction in that sense.

Malcolm wrote:

What is the experience you are being introduced to? I don't think the term "nature" here is being used in the same way. When we say "nature of the mind", we are referring to the term *sems nyid*, or *cittatā*. It is better translated as "mind essence."

The term "nature" is rather vague.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: Is the nature of mind a fiction?

Content:

Temicco said:

Why then discuss it using positive formulations? It seems potentially misleading, no?

Astus said:

The concept of "nature" (xing 性) has a history in China pre-dating Buddhism. See a short section on nature <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/chinese-metaphysics/#ImpDif>, or for instance the opposing views of <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/mencius/#3> and <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/xunzi/#humans>. Besides that, the concept also comes from India in the form of the tathagatagarbha teachings. So, it is fairly complicated why and how certain terms are used.

It just throws me for a loop when the nature of mind is so frequently discussed as if it's a thing that can be cognized, even if such a view is explicitly shot down. If it's not adding anything on, then why add it on?

One has to communicate somehow. Just consider how nirvana can be easily taken to be some kind of realm or state (e.g. nirvana as dhatu, or as dharma), when it literally means extinction.

Malcolm wrote:

Extinction is a state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: Is the nature of mind a fiction?

Content:

Temicco said:

No.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you now understand the difference between Chan, and Mahāmudra and Dzogchen.

Temicco said:

You're not being very clear. Chan is all about the nature of mind. In what way do you propose it differs from the latter two?

Malcolm wrote:

I was being very clear. In Chan there is no experiential introduction to the nature of the mind. In Mahāmudra and Dzogchen there is. That is the difference. There are other differences as well, but we do not need to discuss them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 2:09 AM

Title: Re: Is the nature of mind a fiction?

Content:

BuddhaFollower said:

Just recognize the conceptualizing mind.

Malcolm wrote:

That is good, but it is not enough.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 2:09 AM

Title: Re: Is the nature of mind a fiction?

Content:

Temicco said:

The nature of mind is explicitly discussed in a wide range of texts, and is pointed out to students in several gong-ans.

Malcolm wrote:

As an experience?

Temicco said:

No.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you now understand the difference between Chan, and Mahāmudra and Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: Is the nature of mind a fiction?

Content:

Temicco said:

The nature of mind is explicitly discussed in a wide range of texts, and is pointed out to students in several gong-ans.

Malcolm wrote:

As an experience?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: Is the nature of mind a fiction?

Content:

Temicco said:

It just throws me for a loop when the nature of mind is so frequently discussed as if it's a thing that can be cognized, even if such a view is explicitly shot down. If it's not adding anything on, then why add it on?

Malcolm wrote:

The cittatā of citta, the so called "nature of the mind," is something that can be recognized. And once recognized, it can be cultivated. This why we have direct introduction in Mahāmudra and Dzogchen.

Astus is speaking from a Chan point of view. Direct introduction does not exist in Chan.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Copper Colored mountain location?

Content:

MiphamFan said:

Might be Maldives too, or maybe the stories have conflated Madagascar and Maldives.

Maldives historically were recorded to have Vajrayana too while there is no evidence for any form of Buddhism on Madagascar AFAIK. Guru Padmasambhava clearly knew some kind of irrigation technology though.

Malcolm wrote:

There is the report of Buddhaguptanatha that there was a colony of Vajrayāna Buddhists living on Madagascar in the 16th century.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 14th, 2016 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

Vasana said:

Doesn't that suppose a false dichotomy between whatever an ultimate truth is and the personal realization of how that truth applies to one's own practice and liberation or am I also missing the intention behind this thread ?

Astus said:

It is, as you say, a difference in focal point. If we get stuck on the question of how things really are, that is missing the point of why the teachings were given. They are not meant as statements about reality, but as instructions for liberation. Therefore, the goal is not clear insight but freedom from dissatisfaction.

Malcolm wrote:

That is painting with an extremely large brush.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2016 at 11:25 PM

Title: Re: Bliss

Content:

pael said:

Is it mental bliss or is it physical bliss? Does it mean bliss of meditative absorption? Can samsaric being benefit bliss of Buddhas before achieving Buddhahood or Bodhisattva bhumis? Does these apply also for purity, permanence and self of Buddhas?

Malcolm wrote:

It is ultimate bliss.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2016 at 8:34 PM

Title: Re: is Buddhism a religious faith?

Content:

smcj said:

I believe that my perspective/approach is more in keeping with my tibetan teachers' approach than the general DW poster. Tibetans don't have prejudices against the subject of religion. In fact they are enthusiastic about their religion. We have issues about our failed religion, and we import our issues into our practice.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't have a failed religion.

smcj said:

When HHST says Vajrayana is polytheistic he says so with a full understanding of what the word means and a full understanding of what the Vajrayana is. What he doesn't understand is our reaction to any word that has "theo" as a root.

Malcolm wrote:

Some people might. I don't. Buddhism is polytheistic in general in its acceptance of Brahma, Indra, Vishnu, etc., as mundane gods.

smcj said:

They can't understand how rejecting our religion means we cherry pick around theirs to make it not a religion.

Malcolm wrote:

Whoever said Buddhadharma is not a religion? Of course it is a religion, it has many non-falsifiable tenets, such as rebirth, karma and so on. It lacks a creator god principle, but other than that it is still a religion.

smcj said:

That doesn't make me a crypto-Christian. It makes a traditionalist Vajrayana practitioner.

Malcolm wrote:

You are a crypto-Christian in so far as you keep complaining that you have issues w/ regard to your "failed" religion. Religions don't fail, by the way, unless faith in them utterly disappears. By that standard, Christianity is the strongest thing going.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2016 at 8:27 PM

Title: Re: ye shes and jalus

Content:

Losal Samten said:

Do you know if this has been translated?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it has, I forget the title, but will get it later

Guru Rinpoche

His Life and Times

by Ngawang Zangpo

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2016 at 7:37 PM

Title: Re: ye shes and jalus

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Based in the Indian account of his bio

Losal Samten said:

Do you know if this has been translated?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it has, I forget the title, but will get it later

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2016 at 7:22 PM

Title: Re: ye shes and jalus

Content:

Losal Samten said:

The rakshasas living there are said to be afflicted and that they dislike the king after he mysteriously had a personality change and stopped them from rakshasa'ing, so it doesn't seem like they're 8th bhumi+ (according to Karma Chagme, although his bias is self-stated).

The present Dordrupchen came from Zangdok Palri and said he saw Padmasambhava in rakshasa form and also saw Avalokiteshvara. Chogyur Lingpa's visit to Zangdok Palri stated that he saw mental emanations of Padmasambhava teaching on the islands to beings of various dispositions and saw different forms of GR on the different stories.

Delog Dawa Drolma said she saw Avalokiteshvara in sambhogakaya form and Padmasambhava in his regular human form. GR is said to have travelled to Camara to specifically tame the rakshasas, and unless he was only 'taming' 8th bhumi

bodhisattvas, he would need to be in a form that they could see and relate to.

In short:

Malcolm wrote:

Dreams and visions are one thing, the question of whether Padmasambhava travelled the Indian colony on Madagascar in order to sorcerously control the natives is quite another. Based in the Indian account of his bio, I think it is safe to say he travelled to somewhere to deal with "rakṣasas," and I personally think that the most sensible place for him to have traveled is Madagascar, YMMV.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2016 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: Bliss

Content:

sangyey said:

Does the view change at all amongst the different schools of Tibetan Buddhism. Perhaps where Nyingma would say that bliss is inherent while Gelug might say bliss is not inherent but only a skillful means?

Malcolm wrote:

It depends on how a given school understands tathāgatagarbha, and the Uttaratantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2016 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: Bliss

Content:

sangyey said:

Is bliss an aspect of Buddha Nature?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as is purity, permanence and self.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2016 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Losal Samten said:

The views are getting worse, not better.

Malcolm wrote:

The cure for views (Buddhist, etc.) is the direct perception of dharmatā, and nothing else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2016 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am addressing the topic, "Obstacles and their elimination."

Queequeg said:

Well, that's the title of the thread, but not quite responsive to my lead post...

Malcolm wrote:

Drink the koolaid, and you will see...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2016 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"When infinite obstacles also arise for those who are properly practicing the sublime Dharma, the sole method for removing them is to supplicate the guru. An instruction better than that has never been taught, is not taught and will never be taught by all the buddhas of the three times. Since all siddhis are obtained when all obstacles are removed, based that, all paths are also traversed. Therefore, supplicating the guru for the purpose of removing all outer, inner and secret obstacles is important."

Queequeg said:

So... are you suggesting that I'm just wondering about who shot the arrow into my eye?

Malcolm wrote:

I am addressing the topic, "Obstacles and their elimination."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2016 at 3:02 AM

Title: Re: Obstacles and their elimination - The Degenerate Age

Content:

Queequeg said:

I was contemplating some obstacles I've identified in my practice - without going into detail, they are deep seated beliefs that restrain me from wholeheartedly exploring certain avenues. They manifest with a feeling of fear of doing wrong. In the course of considering my limitations, it got me thinking of similar obstacles faced by others - for instance, for many Westerners, a belief in God instilled from an early age presents obstacles to Buddhist understanding. Whatever the particular nature of these sorts of

obstacles, they impress me as hindrances to the sort of relinquishment necessary to advance on the path.

The train of thought next got me thinking of the general decline in religious affiliation and the growth of atheism in the developed world. It reminded me of the parable of the doctor who proscribes and then later prescribes milk in the Mahayana Mahaparinirvana Sutra.

The parable in short: There is a royal doctor who indiscriminately prescribed milk as a cure for all ills. One day the king falls ill but the milk prescribed only makes him worse. Another doctor comes along, declares that milk is the wrong cure, cures the king with other medicine. The king rewards the new doctor by making him the royal doctor. The new royal doctor proscribes milk as a cure for any disease throughout the kingdom, and after a time, the entire kingdom comes to see milk more or less as a pathogen. The king falls ill again and after examining him, the new royal doctor prescribes milk as a cure. The king is apprehensive as the new royal doctor had taught for years that milk was a pathogen. The king takes the milk and is cured. The new royal doctor explains that the previous doctor did not understand illness or milk and indiscriminately prescribed milk which might have cure some illnesses, but also made people sick. The nature of illness and the nature of milk must be understood, and when it is understood, milk can be an appropriate cure.

I wonder if the decline in religious affiliation and growth in atheism is a sort of rejection of milk?

In both Tibetan and East Asian Buddhism there is an idea that in a time marked by overall decline in standards of ethics, morality, religion, etc. the real, most profound teachings of Buddhism will spread. I wonder if its the breakdown in the perpetuation of (false) views that permits people open to the most profound teaching to arise, free of the fetters that hold people of previous generations back?

Malcolm wrote:

“When infinite obstacles also arise for those who are properly practicing the sublime Dharma, the sole method for removing them is to supplicate the guru. An instruction better than that has never been taught, is not taught and will never be taught by all the buddhas of the three times. Since all siddhis are obtained when all obstacles are removed, based that, all paths are also traversed. Therefore, supplicating the guru for the purpose of removing all outer, inner and secret obstacles is important.”

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2016 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: is Buddhism a religious faith?

Content:

smcj said:

Let me ask everybody reading this some questions: Why is my position so unpopular?

Malcolm wrote:

Because you are a crypto-Christian and we are not.

conebeckham said:

Hmmm, not sure this is accurate.

Perhaps we could say a "crypto-monotheist?" Even that is not really representative of what smcj is saying, IMO. Shentongpas are often called a number of things, but I never saw him advocate for Faith in Christ as the Son, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

He is always complaining about people rejecting his views because they reject Christianity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2016 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2016 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: is Buddhism a religious faith?

Content:

smcj said:

Let me ask everybody reading this some questions: Why is my position so unpopular?

Malcolm wrote:

Because you are a crypto-Christian and we are not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2016 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: No Truth, Only Pain

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 13th, 2016 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Copper Colored mountain location?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Possibly of interest:

<http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2072&context=himalaya>

Malcolm wrote:
Still voting for Madagascar.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 11:18 PM
Title: Re: Sexual misconduct
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Jeff,

What you say is fine, but it does not address the age in which we live nor the reason for Vajrayāna teachings.

Vajrayāna is a path of nonrenunciation, i.e., it is a path of transformation. While it is certainly true that one should eschew irresponsible and harmful sexual behavior, it is not the case that sexuality is, a priori, a "significant deterrent" to "overcoming the pervasive suffering of samsara."

Since this is the upaya section, it should be observed that Vajrayāna is the path of means. As such, there are many means in Vajrayāna to transform the three or five afflictions into the path of awakening. One needs to be open to this possibility if one is studying Lamrim.

Jeff H said:
I think most of this thread has been the personal opinions of individual Buddhists, which is certainly valid, but lacks apparent grounding in the traditional teachings. Personal opinions that do not account for the traditional teachings can be misleading, in my opinion. As this is posted in the upaya forum, I think a more skillful method is to gain an authoritative overview of the actual teachings first and then freely decide how to conduct ourselves.

Buddhism does not say we "shouldn't have sex". We are free to do whatever we want. Buddhism addresses the consequences. If you want to stop experiencing certain results, or if you want to attain a certain goal, Buddhism teaches us to recognize the normally hidden causes. Buddhism teaches what to abandon and what to adopt IF you want to go in a certain direction.

In the context of overcoming the pervasive suffering of samsara, sexuality is not an innocent pleasure; it is a significant deterrent. The teachings on sexual misconduct are intended to help mitigate the harmful results of our natural sexual tendencies, without undue repression, until such time as we can freely and willingly overcome it.

It is like the verse in the Foundation of All Good Qualities prayer (from the FPMT prayer book): Seeking samsaric pleasures is the door to all suffering:
They are uncertain and cannot be relied upon.
Recognizing these shortcomings,
Please bless me to generate the strong wish for the bliss of liberation.
Or the translation I prefer: Samsara's pleasures are deceptive, give no contentment only torment;
So please bless me to strive sincerely to gain the bliss of perfect freedom.
Sexual bliss is not at all related to the bliss referred to here, except, perhaps, as a grossly imperfect simile.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 10:32 PM

Title: Re: No potential for Buddhahood

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Their impermanence becomes permanent if the mind continues to create afflictions because they 'like' them far more than virtue.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem, Nicholas, is that when samsara and nirvana turned their back on one another, Samantabhadra became a buddha without performing an iota of virtue, and sentient beings became sentient beings without perform a smidgeon of a misdeed.

Nicholas Weeks said:

While no 'misdeed' was done, there was no recognition and that started samsara. So the non-recognition was the fault or flaw in those beings other than Samantabhadra. At least that is how I am reading this commentary. If in that early sublime condition beings could be blind, how pray tell, when we have become darker, stupider and more monstrous could we ever recognize through this darkest glass?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, well, through direct introduction of course, that after all is the point of Dzogchen teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 9:17 PM

Title: Re: Copper Colored mountain location?

Content:

Stewart said:

There is a recent facebook post noting that Kathok Bairo Rinpoche recognised Uluru Mountain (Ayers rock) in Australia as Zangdok Palri.

Malcolm wrote:
Wrong direction...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 9:10 PM
Title: Re: ye shes and jalus
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
There two knnds of rainbow body, greater and lesser. When the body disappears leaving only hair and nails, this lesser.

pael said:
Does this mean that Jesus attained rainbow body?

Malcolm wrote:
No, it does not.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 11:23 AM
Title: Re: No potential for Buddhahood? (from "Can Women ...")
Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Malcolm: Well, at this point they are devas, vastly more intelligent than humans, and have seen the destruction of the world.

Still seems pretty hinky to me. Whether to visit or reside in a realm, higher or lower, causes and conditions are needed. So why does every being rise realm by realm? What causes propel them? They are learning their lesson finally and acting virtuously enough to rise? I would think many would be scared at the death of entire realms and fall back on their favorite of the 3 poisons, which means downward.

Malcolm wrote:
It is all clearly explained by the Koshabhasyam in chapter three. The specific details of karma, the causes and effects of virtuous and nonvirtuous acts, is explained in chapter four. Reading these two chapters and understanding them will address all your qualms.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 7:56 AM
Title: Re: No potential for Buddhahood
Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Malcolm: And yes, if we are indolent and like to suffering for a really long time, sure, we do not have to do anything much, and eventually we will be born in the upper form

realm, hear teachings, attain liberation, and that will be that. Or we can save ourselves the trouble, hear teachings now, put them into practice and at worst achieve buddhahood in the bardo.

OK so all beings in the six realms s l o w l y rise to the form realms.

But these beings in the lower 3 in particular, have no interest in or are more likely still hostile to buddhadharma, so why would they pay attention and practice in the form realm, if they have never had any inclination or disposition to do so before?

Does Ati Yoga accept as accurate this kalpa ending scheme?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, at this point they are devas, vastly more intelligent than humans, and have seen the destruction of the world. Even hell beings can experience compassion for others, for example, when Śākyamuni Buddha was a hell being during the dispensation of the ancient Gautama Buddha.

Yes, Atiyoga basically observes the cosmology presented in the Kośa when it comes to how the karmically created universe is created and destroyed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 6:43 AM

Title: Re: Copper Colored mountain location?

Content:

Fa Dao said:

yes..thats the one I was thinking of as well..its certainly the highest mountain in Madagascar...

Malcolm wrote:

IN general, Tibetans were not very good at understanding the outside world following the 13th century. For example, it was only in the late 19th century that they realized they had completely misidentified the Buddhist region of Magadha. For a few hundred years Tibetans had popularly located it in Assam.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 6:36 AM

Title: Re: Copper Colored mountain location?

Content:

Fa Dao said:

good one... so Im guessing all of the info you have read does not go into anymore detail then?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, but this looks promising, Maromokotro:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 6:30 AM

Title: Re: Copper Colored mountain location?

Content:

Fa Dao said:

awesome! thanks for the info.. however as Madagascar is a good sized island with about a dozen mountains any idea which one it might be?

Malcolm wrote:

The copper colored one?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 6:28 AM

Title: Re: ye shes and jalus

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I think if you relinquish your attachment to your karmic vision, you will easily find Padmasambhava there, just as you will easily find Vimalamitra at Wu Tai Shan, along with many Chinese tourists.

And for that matter, you may also find Avalokiteśvara in South India, at Mt. Potala.

Losal Samten said:

The point is that he's meant to be a nirmanakaya in that form and so doesn't require pure vision, no? The pure vision variant is when he's surrounded by vidyadharas and the 25 disciples, not monsters.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't really know where you got this idea from. The mere fact that he has many faces and hands means that it is Sambhogakāya dimension we are talking about here. I have never seen a nirmanakāya with three faces, six arms, four legs and wings, have you?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 6:26 AM

Title: Re: No potential for Buddhahood? (from "Can Women ...")

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

If your reading is correct, then Dharma practice now is silly and not needed, all we need to do is wait long enough and we will naturally be swept up into the high heavens. (no need for Jesus, true enough)

Sherab Dorje said:

Just in case you didn't know: the high heavens are part of samsara too (ie conditioned and impermanent). Buddhists do not aim (theoretically) for rebirth in the God realms.

Malcolm wrote:

The five pure abodes are indeed part of samsara, but only āryas inhabit them, so called arhats and never returners.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: No potential for Buddhahood? (from "Can Women ...")

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Malcolm: At this point, all sentient beings exist in the two upper form realms. Why? Indeed why?

If hell beings (or any other group) have exhausted their hellish karma - great - but why do they leap up to those high form realms? Seems like they might return to the realm they created the hellish karma in, but to join the sages in those high form realms... does not compute.

If your reading is correct, then Dharma practice now is silly and not needed, all we need to do is wait long enough and we will naturally be swept up into the high heavens. (no need for Jesus, true enough)

Malcolm wrote:

No one said they leaped: the last hell being out of hell take rebirth in the preta realm; the last preta takes rebirth in the animal realm, and so on. This all takes an extraordinary amount of time from our limited 100 year (if we are lucky) perspective.

The reason why the upper form realms do not perish, as near as I can make out, it because they are the location of the pure abodes such as the Akaniṣṭha (not the same as Akaniṣṭha Ganavyuha) , āryas inhabit them. Relevant pages in the Kośabhasyaṃ vol.2, 475-477.

And yes, if we are indolent and like to suffering for a really long time, sure, we do not have to do anything much, and eventually we will be born in the upper form realm, hear teachings, attain liberation, and that will be that. Or we can save ourselves the trouble, hear teachings now, put them into practice and at worst achieve buddhahood in the bardo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 6:11 AM

Title: Re: ye shes and jalus

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I refer you the Vimalakirtinirdesha sūtra, and the teaching there on Śākyamuni's impure buddhafiield, Sahaloka.

Losal Samten said:

What about Padmasambhava appearing as the rakshasa king? According to you, rakshasas are just Madagascan headhunters which were recorded by the Indians as being monsters. Therefore, if ordinary beings can see the headhunters/rakshasas, then we should also find Padmasambhava there, in his monstrous and freakish nirmanakaya form with no problem, as we have the requisite karmic vision, just like the Indians of old, yes?

Malcolm wrote:

I think if you relinquish your attachment to your karmic vision, you will easily find Padmasambhava there, just as you will easily find Vimalamitra at Wu Tai Shan, along with many Chinese tourists.

And for that matter, you may also find Avalokiteśvara in South India, at Mt. Potala.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 6:08 AM

Title: Re: ye shes and jalus

Content:

dzoki said:

Camara is described as being filled with ponds, meadows, parks etc. not a desert filled with herds of goats

Malcolm wrote:

A lot can change in 1200 years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 5:57 AM

Title: Re: Copper Colored mountain location?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Not really sure, but Zandokpalri is located on Ngayab Ling, or Cāmaradvipa (Tail Fan/Whisk Land/Continent/Island) in Sanskrit.

Malcolm wrote:

For which I nominate Madagascar!

Fa Dao said:

Are you being serious? and if so why Madagascar?

Malcolm wrote:

Mainly 1) because the native language of Madagascar is the only language in the world

related to the language of the Borneo headhunters and 2) Buddhaguptanatha, Taranatha's Indian teacher, reported that he received Padmasambhava's transmissions of Hevajra and so on on that Island in the 16th century, back when it was named San Lorenzo in Portuguese. 3) Meru cosmology is an Indo-centric view of the world, and it does in fact refer to real places on our planet, such as Uttarakuru, which is also the same region as the one called "Kuru" by Ptolemy, inhabited by horse riding nomads, etc.

We can understand from the account of the taming of Rudra, the Ramayāna and so on, that Indian shipping lanes were troubled by seagoing pirates related to the headhunters of Borneo, and in the case of Śrī Lanka, there was an out and out war between Indo-Aryans and the headhunting tribes living there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 5:50 AM

Title: Re: No potential for Buddhahood

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Their impermanence becomes permanent if the mind continues to create afflictions because they 'like' them far more than virtue.

Sherab Dorje said:

The impermanent cannot become permanent, the conditioned cannot become unconditioned.

Anything that arises based on causes is conditioned and thus impermanent.

Afflicted views arise based on ignorance. Thus they are conditioned. Thus they cannot be permanent.

Nicholas Weeks said:

Should have put 'permanent' in quotes. If samsara is beginningless, as is ignorance, then as long as ignorance conditions, afflictions will dominate.

Malcolm wrote:

A unique feature of Dzogchen teachings is that it explains the beginning of ignorance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 5:48 AM

Title: Re: No potential for Buddhahood

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Do not follow this. In order to survive the end of the kalpa does not one need to be in already or rise at the last moment into the 'two upper form realms'? If so, then only

virtuous folk would be there.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you might need a bit of review on chapter three of the Abhidharmakośabhasyaṃ.

Nicholas Weeks said:

Therefore we monsters (in the lower realms) with no gotra of buddha family would be wiped out and unable to attain buddhahood. What would happen to those beings in the next kalpa when those six realms reappear, is not clear. Is their karmic slate pristine or do they begin at the bottom again, being bad or badder?

Malcolm wrote:

The way it works is like this, according to Abhidharma:

After the last sentient being leaves the hell realm, the hells disappear.

After the last sentient being leaves the preta realm, the preta realm disappears.

After the last sentient being leaves the animal realm, the animal realm disappears.

After the last sentient being leaves the human realm, the human realm disappears.

After the last sentient being leaves the lower deva realms, the deva realms disappear (including the asuras), with the exception of the two upper form realm heavens.

At this point, all sentient beings exist in the two upper form realms. Why?

After the last sentient being leaves the hell realm, the hells disappear because all karma to generate the hell realms has been purified in all sentient beings who are to be born there.

After the last sentient being leaves the preta realm, the preta realm disappear because...

After the last sentient being leaves the animal realm, the animal realm disappear because...

After the last sentient being leaves the human realm, the human realm disappear because...

After the last sentient being leaves the lower deva realms, the deva realms disappear, with the exception of the two upper form realm heavens, because all karma to generate the the lower deva realms has been purified in all sentient beings who are to be born there.

So every thing up to the Brahmaloкас disappear because there are no more sentient beings with karma to be born there, since that karma has been exhausted, apart from subtle traces.

Those traces are however important, because according to the Abhidharma scheme, these traces are what causes the six lokas to gradually reappear, from the Brahmaloका on down to the hells, one realm at a time, from top to bottom as sentient beings gradually gather again the karma to be born in those realms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Copper Colored mountain location?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Not really sure, but Zandokpalri is located on Ngayab Ling, or Cāmaradvipa (Tail Fan/Whisk Land/Continent/Island) in Sanskrit.

Malcolm wrote:

For which I nominate Madagascar!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 5:24 AM

Title: Re: is Buddhism a religious faith?

Content:

smcj said:

That is a very popular idea here in the West.

tiagolps said:

I would argue that vajrayana and Ancient Greek religion are very different things, despite in your opinion being both "polytheistic".

smcj said:

Making offerings, supplicating and praying to multiple deities doesn't strike you as polytheistic? You've got to do a lot of mental gymnastics to avoid the obvious.

And dzogchen eternalistic? no.

How about monistic, er, um, I mean "nondual"? Evidently Kongtrul saw it that way.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Dzogchen is also not monistic. How can a diversity be monistic?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: No potential for Buddhahood

Content:

Tenso said:

It's impossible. There's no finite number of beings.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not impossible [for all sentient beings to attain buddhahood], whether it is a finite set, or an infinite set.

Tenso said:

They can but won't. Majority population aren't Buddhist and never will be on this globe. Maybe you are taking Dzogchen texts way too literally?

Malcolm wrote:

I think the time frame indicated here is a little broader...and when all sentient beings do attain buddhahood, this globe will no longer exist, since it will have been destroyed in the cataclysms at the end of the eon, mentioned above.

In any case, I do not take Dzogchen teachings any more nor any less literally than you appear to take Pureland teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 5:19 AM

Title: Re: No potential for Buddhahood

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Sounds like Adibuddha Samantabhadra does what Jesus is supposed to do,
Sounds like you missed the lesson on the impermanent nature of the afflictive states.

Nicholas Weeks said:

Their impermanence becomes permanent if the mind continues to create afflictions because they 'like' them far more than virtue.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem, Nicholas, is that when samsara and nirvana turned their back on one another, Samantabhadra became a buddha without performing an iota of virtue, and sentient beings became sentient beings without perform a smidgeon of a misdeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

maybay said:

The method behind Abhidharma, similarly, is not concerned with postulating theories based on statistical probabilities and verifying these through conducting experiments, resulting in "facts". There are no facts in Abhidharma. The Abhidharma takes the words of the Buddha as law / Dharma, and then through experience and inference, and through a process of much even handed debate, arrives at the most convincing extension of this understanding. If the Buddha never explicitly proclaimed the geometry of the earth, you can be sure it was not of any significance.

Malcolm wrote:

Abhidharma does not accept every word the Buddha said as literally true. For example, the debate with the Pudgalavadin's who introduce various statements of the Buddha which they take literally in order to prove there is an inexpressible pudgala which

transmigrates. Vasubandhu shows them [hopefully] that their understanding is mistaken by explaining the real sense of the passages the former interpret literally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: No potential for Buddhahood

Content:

Tenso said:

It's impossible. There's no finite number of beings.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not impossible [for all sentient beings to attain buddhahood], whether it is a finite set, or a infinite set.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: No potential for Buddhahood

Content:

maybay said:

This should not be understood as an ontological postulate. Atiyoga rhetoric is entirely solipsistic. When the doctrine is detached from it's context it appears as nothing more than wishful thinking.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, it is meant to be taken literally.

maybay said:

No solipsism would be complete without a literal interpretation.

Malcolm wrote:

It is up to you to prove atiyoga is solipsistic. I know you can't prove it, but it will be ever so entertaining to observe your flailing attempts.

maybay said:

Space is my witness.

Malcolm wrote:

You definitely need space in order to flail around.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: ye shes and jalus

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, Vimalamitra is supposed to reside at Wu Tai Shan, in China, and Padmasambhava at the Copper Colored Mt. in the southwestern continent of Camara, which seems to be Madagascar.

RikudouSennin said:
It is known.

dzoki said:

I have some doubts as to Camara being Madagascar. One of my university professors spent some time there (I studied geology) and said that people there basically deforested half of the island and turned everything into a semi desert, they ate all of the animals (except for goats), so that after two months in the field doing research the research team met only one lizard and one grasshopper - that was it, they destroyed all of the infrastructure that French left there - such as schools, public buildings, bridges, railroads etc.

Southern half of the island is better off, it has some of the original forests, but overall the whole country is in very poor state. One would expect that influence of Padmasambhava's pure realm would influence the people to be more virtuous and take better care of their environment and lives.

I think Camara is in other dimension, just like Dremojong, Jambu River etc.

Malcolm wrote:

I refer you the Vimalakirtinirdesha sūtra, and the teaching there on Śakyamuni's impure buddhahood, Sahaloka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 4:57 AM

Title: Re: No potential for Buddhahood

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Practically speaking then, there are those who will 'never' make use of their buddha nature.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this may be taught in sūtras, good thing this is an idea rejected completely in Atiyoga where it is held that all sentient beings will attain buddhahood.

Nicholas Weeks said:

How nice for we monsters. But how can we 'attain' when our disposition is hostile to buddhahood? If the buddhas (or a buddha) can transform or inspire demonic folk, then all glory to Them, but where is the 'attainment'?

Sounds like Adibuddha Samantabhadra does what Jesus is supposed to do,

Malcolm wrote:

No, it does not work like that at all.

You seem to have forgotten that each of the six realms vanishes when it is emptied of sentient beings, beginning with the hell realms. This is common also to Abhidharma. However, the two upper form realms never disappear, even though everything below them is destroyed by cataclysms of fire, air and water at the end of the eon. The main difference between this cosmological idea in Abhidharma and Dzogchen is that in the latter, it is held by Garab Dorje that all sentient beings attain buddhahood through the practice of Atiyoga. So here, the idea that there is no one devoid of the gotra, family of buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 4:35 AM

Title: Re: No potential for Buddhahood

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Practically speaking then, there are those who will 'never' make use of their buddha nature.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this may be taught in sūtras, good thing this is an idea rejected completely in Atiyoga where it is held that all sentient beings will attain buddhahood.

maybay said:

This should not be understood as an ontological postulate. Atiyoga rhetoric is entirely solipsistic. When the doctrine is detached from it's context it appears as nothing more than wishful thinking.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, it is meant to be taken literally.

It is up to you to prove atiyoga is solipsistic. I know you can't prove it, but it will be ever so entertaining to observe your flailing attempts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: No potential for Buddhahood

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Practically speaking then, there are those who will 'never' make use of their buddha nature.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this may be taught in sūtras, good thing this is an idea rejected completely in Atiyoga where it is held that all sentient beings will attain buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Malcolm,

Thurman accepts the traditional view, a pretty good scholar. Also why would Vasubandhu comment on his brother's works if he thought Maitreya the Regent was not the guru of Asanga? Also Thurman uses Maitreya-natha for the Regent, because 'nath' means something like Lord, which can be applied to the mahasattva.

This is also OT, so fare thee well, our contentious one.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Nicholas,

It is not off topic, because you invoked the authority of this account in your defense of this position.

I don't accept this traditional Tibetan account because it is contradicted by Chinese sources, and because it does not appear until centuries after Asanga.

Now, is it possible that Asanga received these five texts in a vision. Perhaps, however, I don't believe this is so, because of the stylistic consistency of the five treatises, the great difference between them and Asanga's mode of writing, and because of a complete absence of confirmation about this from the Madhyamaka school. It is therefore my belief that Maitreyanātha was an Indian scholar who summarized the three main trends of Mahāyāna sūtras in five texts who lived before Asanga and after Nāgārjuna, and that is about as much as we actually know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 12th, 2016 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: ye shes and jalus

Content:

dzoki said:

What about others who are said to be around, such a Shawaripa, Tilopa and Maitripa, is their attainment a rainbow body in a dzogchen sense, or is it something else? To be

more precise - their attainment is called deathless vajra body - can this be equated to rainbow body or is it of a different nature?

Malcolm wrote:

More or less the same. And don't forget Babaji!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2016 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: is Buddhism a religious faith?

Content:

smcj said:

I think Mahamudra and Dzogchen are theo-monistic (eternalistic).

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2016 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: ye shes and jalus

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

According to tradition, Padmasambhava and Vimalamitra are still around.

.

florin said:

In what sense are they still around ?

The deities and the guardians are still around and will be long after i die.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, Vimalamitra is supposed to reside at Wu Tai Shan, in China, and Padmasambhava at the Copper Colored Mt. in the southwestern continent of Camara, which seems to be Madagascar.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2016 at 8:16 PM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

The tradition of Maitreya the Regent is supported by Mipham, Vasubandhu and many

others - it is strong enough to satisfy me.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, there is no place where Vasubandhu makes this identification.

This is a later tradition, post-Vasubandhu, making its first appearance in the works of Xuantsang, and in fact the Chinese tradition itself is all over the map. By the eighth century however, the tradition is solidified in India (nearly five centuries after the dates generally assumed for the composition of the five treatises, i.e. late 3rd, early 4th century), and thus the Tibetan sources are univocal on this point.

The fact that Mipham reports a tradition that is demonstrably late and has no foundation in the core texts we are discussing themselves is of no weight whatsoever.

The fact is that no Madhyamaka authors until the Haribhadra make this identification, especially in light of Vimuktisena making no mention of it, and the fact that Vasubandhu's main student, Sthiramati, makes no mention of it either. The latter merely refers to Maitreya as "Ārya Maitreya," and while he indicates that the author of the Madhyantavibhanga is impeded by only a single birth, he offers no details on the transmission of the text to Asanga apart from noting that it was bestowed upon Asanga through the blessings of Maitreya.

As we move through the texts in time, we can see the story becoming more elaborated and fleshed out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2016 at 6:38 PM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Ārya-vimaladattapariṣcchā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra depicts a conversation between the eighth stage female bodhisattva Ārya Vimaladatta and Maudgalyāna. He asked her why she has not changed her gender. She replies, "Why haven't you changed yours since you are the master of miraculous power," and then says: Venerable Mahā Maudgalyāna, the body of a woman cannot attain the awakening of manifest perfect buddhahood. The body of a man cannot attain the awakening of manifest perfect buddhahood. Why? Because awakening does not arise, therefore, the body and mind are incapable of manifest perfect buddhahood

Losal Samten said:

That's the View, not Path.

Malcolm wrote:

No, my friend, you are incorrect. The very fact that she engages with Maudgalyāna in why she has not changed her gender indicates this is all three: view, path and result.

This entire sūtra is very interesting, in so far as Vimaladatta takes on all the Buddha's major arhat disciples and defeats them in debate over the question of gender, one by one.

Then of course there is the Nirvana Sūtra which says very clearly, "Here in Jamudvipa I exhibit buddhahood in the body of a woman."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2016 at 6:22 PM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Losal Samten said:

<http://dharma.wheel.net/viewtopic.php?p=337330#p337330>

Malcolm wrote:

That does not explain that women cannot become buddhas.

Losal Samten said:

How can a mahasattva attain buddhahood as a female if they are never again born as a woman?

Malcolm wrote:

The Ārya-vimaladattapariṣcchā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra depicts a conversation between the eighth stage female bodhisattva Ārya Vimaladatta and Maudgalyāna. He asked her why she has not changed her gender. She replies, "Why haven't you changed yours since you are the master of miraculous power," and then says:

Venerable Mahā Maudgalyāna, the body of a woman cannot attain the awakening of manifest perfect buddhahood. The body of a man cannot attain the awakening of manifest perfect buddhahood. Why? Because awakening does not arise, therefore, the body and mind are incapable of manifest perfect buddhahood

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2016 at 6:03 PM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Where in Prajñāpāramita sūtras does it explain a woman cannot become a Buddha?

Losal Samten said:

<http://dharma.wheel.net/viewtopic.php?p=337330#p337330>

Malcolm wrote:

That does not explain that women cannot become buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2016 at 5:52 PM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Losal Samten said:

In that case the Prajnaparamita in 8000 lines is provisional

Malcolm wrote:

??? Explain.

Where in Prajñāpāramita sūtras does it explain a woman cannot become a Buddha?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2016 at 5:25 PM

Title: Re: ye shes and jalus

Content:

ClearblueSky said:

I'm slightly confused by this. If ordinary people see you the same, and yet you are not becoming a body that dies, why isn't everybody that achieved rainbow body still just walking around for people to see? Most of the accounts of rainbow body I've read the people "disappeared", maybe leaving behind hair and nails.

If you ordinary people see you as you were, does this include your hair and nails? What about clothes, do those dissolve with you and you stay in that outfit, or do ordinary people see you walking around the same but naked?

Malcolm wrote:

There two knds of rainbow body, greater and lesser. When the body disappears leaving only hair and nails, this lesser.

ClearblueSky said:

Okay, then with the Greater:

1. If even ordinary people see you "just as you were", why aren't some that achieved rainbow body still just walking around for ordinary people to see?
2. Do you somehow dissolve your clothes with you and stay in that outfit, or do ordinary people see you walking around the same, but naked?

Malcolm wrote:

According to tradition, Padmasambhava and Vimalamitra are still around.

I am pretty sure jyou need to change your clothes as they wear out, even if you have attained great transference body.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2016 at 5:20 PM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Losal Samten said:

"Irreversible" refers to the 8th bhumi which requires two incalculable kalpas to reach. Being that the words from a sutra trump that of a sastra, Asanga is incorrect in this case if the translations are correct.

And as pointed out, at any rate beings do not realise buddhahood in a female body in sutrayana, and saying that they do is both extra-textual and contra-textual.

Malcolm wrote:

Maintaining that women are incapable of attaining buddhahood in a female body is a samaya violation for any Vajrayana practitioner, just as holding that there are icchantikas.

Losal Samten said:

Good thing I'm not doing that then, eh? Of course the Basis/Path/Fruit of the tantras overrides the Basis/Path/Fruit of the sutras.

However I do not think that misrepresenting/whitewashing the sutras does anyone any benefit.

Malcolm wrote:

Some sutras are provisional, others are not. In general, yogacara sutras are provisional and interpretable because they contain doctrines such as icchantikas and so on. The idea that buddhahood is gender based is also provisional and not definitive, no whitewashing required.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2016 at 4:33 PM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

There is more to buddhadharma than 'views' and refutations or supports thereof, Malcolm.

If there is not a thread already on those with no potential or just lacking it, we ought to have one. A very interesting subject.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there are also provisional teachings and definitive ones; follow the latter, not former. This why no one follows yogacara anymore. They observe too many provisional teachings.

maybay said:

You needn't chose one in place of the other. But do chose patience and resolve over petulance and obduracy. If for no other reason than better health.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you must choose, actually. The sutras themselves indicate this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2016 at 10:20 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there are also provisional teachings and definitive ones; follow the latter, not former. This why no one follows yogacara anymore. They observe too many provisional teachings.

Nicholas Weeks said:

Odd, is it not, that our future Buddha Maitreya taught what he did and now 'no one follows' it anymore - or so Malcolm says.

Malcolm wrote:

Maitreyanatha was an Indian scholar, not the future buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2016 at 9:58 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

There is more to buddhadharma than 'views' and refutations or supports thereof, Malcolm.

If there is not a thread already on those with no potential or just lacking it, we ought to have one. A very interesting subject.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there are also provisional teachings and definitive ones; follow the latter, not former. This why no one follows yogacara anymore. They observe too many provisional teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2016 at 9:36 AM

Title: Re: ye shes and jalus

Content:

Tenso said:

how are these two the same and different from one another?

thanks

Malcolm wrote:

It does not mean that you suddenly burst into rainbow light, if you attain this in this life, ordinary people will still see you just as you were, but perhaps you will not cast a shadow.

ClearblueSky said:

I'm slightly confused by this. If ordinary people see you the same, and yet you are not becoming a body that dies, why isn't everybody that achieved rainbow body still just walking around for people to see? Most of the accounts of rainbow body I've read the people "disappeared", maybe leaving behind hair and nails.

If you ordinary people see you as you were, does this include your hair and nails? What about clothes, do those dissolve with you and you stay in that outfit, or do ordinary people see you walking around the same but naked?

Malcolm wrote:

There two kinds of rainbow body, greater and lesser. When the body disappears leaving only hair and nails, this lesser.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2016 at 9:27 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Losal Samten said:

"Irreversible" refers to the 8th bhumi which requires two incalculable kalpas to reach.

Being that the words from a sutra trump that of a sastra, Asanga is incorrect in this case if the translations are correct.

And as pointed out, at any rate beings do not realise buddhahood in a female body in sutrayana, and saying that they do is both extra-textual and contra-textual.

Malcolm wrote:

Maintaining that women are incapable of attaining buddhahood in a female body is a samaya violation for any Vajrayana practitioner, just as holding that there are icchantikas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2016 at 9:23 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So you understand that this point of view is utterly rejected by Madhyamaka?

Why would anyone wish to follow the tenets of a lower school when there is a higher one available? As for Mipham, this is not his personal position.

Nicholas Weeks said:

Malcolm: Are you now going to adopt the yogacara position that there are also so called icchantikas, sentient beings absolutely incapable of buddhahood?

Always have, since Maitreya bodhisattva says so in his Ornament IV:11 and Ju Mipham accepts that:

“Lack of potential” can mean either that the cause of liberation is temporarily lacking or that liberation remains permanently impossible.”

Excerpt From: Maitreya. “Ornament of the Great Vehicle Sutras.” iBooks.

The group where 'liberation remains permanently impossible' is quite small, one hopes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2016 at 8:52 AM

Title: No potential for Buddhahood? (from "Can Women ...")

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Are you now going to adopt the yogacara position that there are also so called icchantikas, sentient beings absolutely incapable of buddhahood?

Nicholas Weeks said:

Arya Asanga, a Third Ground bodhisattva, says in his Bodhisattvabhumi that women cannot reach annutarasamyaksambodhi. Because they have too many mental afflictions and inferior wisdom.

During the first of the three big kalpas bodhisattvas use female bodies if they wish, but after that time period (a mere 10 to the 59th power years) they use only male bodies. So women can become great bodhisattvas, but not full Buddhas.

See Engle's new translation The Bodhisattva Path to Unsurpassed Enlightenment, pp 169-70.

Astus said:

The Astasahasrika says otherwise, attributing the freedom from female birth to much higher level bodhisattvas.

"Endowed with these attributes, tokens and signs a Bodhisattva should be borne in mind as irreversible from full enlightenment. Furthermore, an irreversible Bodhisattva does not pander to Shramanas and Brahmins of other schools, telling them that they

know what is worth knowing, that they see what is worth seeing. He pays no homage to strange Gods, offers them no flowers, incenses, etc., does not put his trusts in them. He is no more reborn in the places of woe, nor does he ever again become a woman."
(PP 8000 17.1, tr Conze)

Nicholas Weeks said:

No PDF yet, so I have been too lazy (until now) to quote the full passage:

All buddhas are the same in every respect and free of differences, except for these four things: life span, name, caste, and physical size. The distinction among buddhas is due to a variation in these four qualities and not to anything else whatsoever.

A woman cannot attain unsurpassed true and complete enlightenment. Why is that?

Once a bodhisattva has passed beyond the first [period of a] countless number of kalpas he abandons the state of being a woman, and [from then on] until he sits at the seat of enlightenment, he will never again become a woman.

The entirety of womankind naturally possesses a great many mental afflictions and is subject to inferior wisdom, and it is not possible for [a person with] a mind stream that naturally possesses a great many mental afflictions and is subject to inferior wisdom to attain unsurpassed true and complete enlightenment.

The first short graph giving the only four distinctions among buddhas does not list sex.

As to what exactly Astus means by 'much higher level bodhisattvas', I do not know. In any case both this sutra and Asanga agree that at some point the woman state is not used. That does not mean that female buddhas or bodhisattvas do not appear. At the 8th Ground the power to appear as any sort of being, even buddhas, is gained.

The main reason for bringing up this subject again is that I tired of seeing all the sociology supposedly ruling the buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 11th, 2016 at 7:44 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Losal Samten said:

"Irreversible" refers to the 8th bhumi which requires two incalculable kalpas to reach.

Being that the words from a sutra trump that of a sastra, Asanga is incorrect in this case if the translations are correct.

And as pointed out, at any rate beings do not realise buddhahood in a female body in sutrayana, and saying that they do is both extra-textual and contra-textual.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is a mistake. If this is the case, then it would be possible to identify a tathagata through marks, a possibility excluded by the Vajrachhedika among other sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2016 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: ye shes and jalus

Content:

Harimoo said:

To be shadowless is quite common in many different religions/traditions (like the shadowless Prophet).

In Dzogchen, is there people who are shadowless but are still considered to be in a basic level of accomplishment ?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2016 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

maybay said:

They are mostly aiming for enlightened society not personal Buddhahood. .

Malcolm wrote:

???

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2016 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: How appearances arise

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are no thoughts to create a partition if there is no mind.

gad rgyangs said:

and if, as you believe, sentient beings are delusions, then how reliable are the partitions created by their minds? wouldn't all such partitions also be delusions?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure. But we start at delusion and work backwards.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2016 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The point, Astus, is that each of these dhyānas is in fact a concept on which we focus, where as you treat them as if they are grades of consciousness, which they are not.

Astus said:

Do you mean that dhyanas are not stages of mental tranquillity, but a number of conceptual focuses people may be absorbed in according to their inclination?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. For example, one of Buddha's teacher taught him that meditating on 'infinite emptiness' was the highest stage of liberation, the other, that "neither perception nor nonperception" is the highest state. But these are just mental concepts upon which he focused, and he discovered that by focusing them they created paths for rebirth.

This is also why it is said that śamatha without vipaśyāna merely creates a cause for birth as a lower form realm deity, because it is conceptual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2016 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

maybay said:

. If they were so perfect the likes of Chogyam Trungpa would not have taught an alternative.

Malcolm wrote:

I think he just suffered from a lack of imagination. He was too conditioned by being a Tibetan aristocrat. This is why he liked commonwealth countries more than the US, in the end. Canada after all still has the Queen on the dollar. Democracy made Trungpa nervous, even though he enjoyed it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2016 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: How appearances arise

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

thought creates partitions of manifestation into "me" "you" "the table" etc. these may or may not be useful, but since they are changeable, they cannot be fundamental. only the fact of manifestation is fundamental. That is why it is less clear to claim that the basis is a quality of "mind" as if mind were a self-existent entity: "mind" is a partition created by thought, just like "table".

Malcolm wrote:

There are no thoughts to create a partition if there is no mind.

And, since, as you say, when you discover your own state, you also discover the state of the "universe" (i.e. gcig shes kun grol), this reduces the so called "basis" to a set of generic qualities. This does not render a mind "self-existent."

For example, Āryadeva says that when you discover the emptiness of one thing, you discover the emptiness of all things. But this does not mean there is an emptiness "out there" which pervades everything, anymore than there is a basis "out there" which is the foundation for manifestation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2016 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Your model is some strange version that does not account for this fact.

Astus said:

How doesn't it account for it? I simply defined the basic focus of each stage. And of course one can get stuck at any stage. Moving to the next level depends on relinquishing the previous one. At the same time, it is also possible to let go of everything and attain liberation at any given stage.

Malcolm wrote:

The point, Astus, is that each of these dhyānas is in fact a concept on which we focus, where as you treat them as if they are grades of consciousness, which they are not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2016 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: How appearances arise

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so then why do you say that each sentient being is an irreducible basis?

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't.

"Basis" is just a term used to describe something one has not realized. There is no basis apart from that, which I have said repeatedly.

gad rgyangs said:

but you are saying there is nothing but self-existent, irreducible consciousnesses, which are delusions (thats already a contradiction), each of which have "their own

basis", presumably which will allow them at some point in the future to become buddhas. so what will exist then, a bunch of self-existent buddhas? and will each of those buddhas have a basis or not?

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say anything of the kind anywhere. I never made such a claim and neither do Dzogchen texts.

You seem to think there is some kind of basis, which you imagine to be transcendent (aka free from extremes), out of which there arises an appearance (how and to whom?); despite the obvious contradiction in such a position if your putative basis is just blank emptiness free from extremes (i.e. something which does not exist at all, conventionally or otherwise).

When the Dzogchen texts are talking about "the basis" in terms of essence, nature and compassion, they are talking about qualities of the nature of the mind, not some transcendent pleroma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 10th, 2016 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: How appearances arise

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Because sentient beings are delusions that self-appear from the dhātu of luminosity. That's the point.

gad rgyangs said:

so then why do you say that each sentient being is an irreducible basis?

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't.

"Basis" is just a term used to describe something one has not realized. There is no basis apart from that, which I have said repeatedly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Astus said:

The model I have provided is mostly my take on the sutta teachings. As noted above, there is no Mahayana version of the eight stages model. As for Zen, dhyana goes

together with wisdom, and they together refer to the essence (emptiness) and function (discernment) of the nature of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem with your model is that each of the dhyānas represents a conceptual focus. That is why we can take rebirth in the corresponding realms when we focus on them. So for example, if we make intense meditation on "everything is emptiness" as a conceptual focus, this means we will take rebirth in that realm.

Buddha cruised through them, one at a time, and saw how the four noble truths related to each abode, and eradicated that potential for rebirth.

Your model is some strange version that does not account for this fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: How appearances arise

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

your sig makes a bit more sense except for a couple of things: first, calling sentient beings "delusions" implies that there is a really-existent sentient being that is having the delusion (a delusion requires an agent that is deluded). That is incoherent, and also a needless proliferation: why not just say that sentient beings are clear appearances of a basis that is neither being nor nothing?

Malcolm wrote:

Because sentient beings are delusions that self-appear from the dhātu of luminosity. That's the point.

gad rgyangs said:

And calling sentient beings "self appearing" implies that sentient beings are not dependent arisings, but are dripping with svabhava (which contradicts calling them "delusions". "production from itself" anyone?). The way to correct this is to say that they are appearing from the dhatu of luminosity, but that the dhatu of luminosity is a quality (really better expressed as the activity of lhun grub rather than what sounds like a substantive noun) pointing to (not "a quality of") the basis which is beyond all categories and qualities.

Malcolm wrote:

Take it up with Mipham.

The rest of your qualms are from the point of view of relative truth. So who cares?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 10:53 PM
Title: Re: How appearances arise
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
so now you're saying a self-originated imputation imputes itself?

Malcolm wrote:
Why not? That is essentially how the process of delusion is explained.

gad rgyangs said:
why not? because its completely incoherent and of no use whatsoever in either trying to understand the nature of reality nor in reducing suffering.

Malcolm wrote:
According to you suffering is just a reification, so not a problem.

And why do you need a "coherent" explanation, isn't that just another reification?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 10:23 PM
Title: Re: How appearances arise
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
so now you're saying a self-originated imputation imputes itself?

smcj said:
You should check out the signature at the bottom of Malcolm's posts.

gad rgyangs said:
yes but he is currently claiming the opposite: that the "dhatu of luminosity" is nothing but a "quality" of an irreducible and self-existing consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:
You are claiming that on my behalf, I made no such claim.

But the dhātu of luminosity, according to Mipham, is just the clarity and emptiness of one's mind.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: How appearances arise

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

"consciousness" is a designation, an imputation. How can an imputation be self-originated?

Malcolm wrote:

The real question is how can it not be? For an imputation to be made, there has to be something which imputes. Imputations do not exist apart from minds which impute.

gad rgyangs said:

so now you're saying a self-originated imputation imputes itself?

Malcolm wrote:

Why not? That is essentially how the process of delusion is explained.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is just monastic misogyny, nothing more, nothing less.

Losal Samten said:

Is women not being able to become pratyekabuddhas also down to monastic bigotry, even though they can achieve arhatship?

Malcolm wrote:

Most definitely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 8:22 PM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

To repeat (wish folks would read more closely):

"Arya Asanga, a Third Ground bodhisattva, says in his Bodhisattvabhumi that women cannot reach annutarasamyaksambodhi. Because they have too many mental afflictions and inferior wisdom."

So wisdom has many degrees and that of a full Buddha cannot be reached in a female body - not because of genitalia, anymore than a Buddha is one because of his genitalia.

Malcolm wrote:

This is just monastic misogyny, nothing more, nothing less. Also I will remind you that third stage bodhisattvas also have only partially removed the afflictive obscuration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 7:27 PM

Title: Re: How appearances arise

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The question is wrong. If you ask me what the term "basis" means in Dzogchen teachings, I can answer.

Otherwise, consciousness, whether pristine or not, has no basis. As far as anyone can actually tell, one's consciousness is self-originated and self-organized, without any other creator.

gad rgyangs said:

"consciousness" is a designation, an imputation. How can an imputation be self-originated?

Malcolm wrote:

The real question is how can it not be? For an imputation to be made, there has to be something which imputes. Imputations do not exist apart from minds which impute.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 6:57 PM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

smcj said:

One of the Vajrayana precepts is to not disparage women as being inferior.

maybay said:

Most Vajrayana precepts speak to Mahayana doctrine. This does not mean to reject Mahayana doctrine. In fact all this fuss brings up other precepts:

3. Condemn and/or create problems with one's Vajra brothers and sisters
6. Slander the scriptures of Mahayana and Vajrayana
12. Fail to transmit authentic Dharma

Malcolm wrote:

14. Claim that women are incapable of buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 11:07 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So, production is not real and nonproduction is real, correct?

Astus said:

They form a single reality together.

in order for there to be an eye consciousness, there has to be an external object, a form, of which that consciousness is aware

catmoon said:

Malcolm does this mean you are a Dzogchen Platonist? What would be the difference between the form you speak of and a Platonic ideal?

Malcolm wrote:

Not that kind form.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 11:04 AM

Title: Re: How appearances arise

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

there you go again, claiming that consciousness is the basis of the basis? of itself? what do you claim then is the basis of consciousness?

Malcolm wrote:

The term "basis" itself just refers to something we have not realized. What have we not realized? The nature of our own minds.

gad rgyangs said:

you did not answer the question: what are you claiming is the basis of consciousness?

Malcolm wrote:

The question is wrong. If you ask me what the term "basis" means in Dzogchen teachings, I can answer.

Otherwise, consciousness, whether pristine or not, has no basis. As far as anyone can actually tell, one's consciousness is self-originated and self-organized, without any other creator.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: How appearances arise

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

there you go again, claiming that consciousness is the basis of the basis? of itself? what do you claim then is the basis of consciousness?

Malcolm wrote:

The term "basis" itself just refers to something we have not realized. What have we not realized? The nature of our own minds.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Losal Samten said:

Couldn't Asanga's assertions be valid for the sutra path, with women still being capable in mantrayana? There would be no conflict, no?

Malcolm wrote:

Take it up with the Goddess of the Ganges, I suspect she has a thing or two to say about this:

Thereupon, a certain goddess who lived in that house, having heard this teaching of the Dharma of the great heroic bodhisattvas, and being delighted, pleased, and overjoyed, manifested herself in a material body and showered the great spiritual heroes, the bodhisattvas, and the great disciples with heavenly flowers. When the flowers fell on the bodies of the bodhisattvas, they fell off on the floor, but when they fell on the bodies of the great disciples, they stuck to them and did not fall. The great disciples shook the flowers and even tried to use their magical powers, but still the flowers would not shake off. Then, the goddess said to the venerable Sariputra, "Reverend Sariputra, why do you shake these flowers?"

Sariputra replied, "Goddess, these flowers are not proper for religious persons and so we are trying to shake them off."

The goddess said, "Do not say that, reverend Sariputra. Why? These flowers are proper indeed! Why? Such flowers have neither constructual thought nor discrimination. But the elder Sariputra has both constructual thought and discrimination.

"Reverend Sariputra, impropriety for one who has renounced the world for the discipline of the rightly taught Dharma consists of constructual thought and discrimination, yet the elders are full of such thoughts. One who is without such thoughts is always proper.

"Reverend Sariputra, see how these flowers do not stick to the bodies of these great spiritual heroes, the bodhisattvas! This is because they have eliminated constructual thoughts and discriminations.

"For example, evil spirits have power over fearful men but cannot disturb the fearless. Likewise, those intimidated by fear of the world are in the power of forms, sounds, smells, tastes, and textures, which do not disturb those who are free from fear of the passions inherent in the constructive world. Thus, these flowers stick to the bodies of those who have not eliminated their instincts for the passions and do not stick to the bodies of those who have eliminated their instincts. Therefore, the flowers do not stick to the bodies of these bodhisattvas, who have abandoned all instincts."

Then the venerable Sariputra said to the goddess, "Goddess, how long have you been in this house?"

The goddess replied, "I have been here as long as the elder has been in liberation."

Sariputra said, "Then, have you been in this house for quite some time?"

The goddess said, "Has the elder been in liberation for quite some time?"

At that, the elder Sariputra fell silent.

The goddess continued, "Elder, you are 'foremost of the wise!' Why do you not speak? Now, when it is your turn, you do not answer the question."

Sariputra: Since liberation is inexpressible, goddess, I do not know what to say.

Goddess: All the syllables pronounced by the elder have the nature of liberation. Why? Liberation is neither internal nor external, nor can it be apprehended apart from them. Likewise, syllables are neither internal nor external, nor can they be apprehended anywhere else. Therefore, reverend Sariputra, do not point to liberation by abandoning speech! Why? The holy liberation is the equality of all things!

Sariputra: Goddess, is not liberation the freedom from desire, hatred, and folly?

Goddess: "Liberation is freedom from desire, hatred, and folly" that is the teaching of the excessively proud. But those free of pride are taught that the very nature of desire, hatred, and folly is itself liberation.

Sariputra: Excellent! Excellent, goddess! Pray, what have you attained, what have you realized, that you have such eloquence?

Goddess: I have attained nothing, reverend Sariputra. I have no realization. Therefore I have such eloquence. Whoever thinks, "I have attained! I have realized!" is overly proud in the discipline of the well-taught Dharma.

Sariputra: Goddess, do you belong to the disciple-vehicle, to the solitary-vehicle, or to the great vehicle?

Goddess: I belong to the disciple-vehicle when I teach it to those who need it. I belong to the solitary-vehicle when I teach the twelve links of dependent origination to those who need them. And, since I never abandon the great compassion, I belong to the great vehicle, as all need that teaching to attain ultimate liberation.

Nevertheless, reverend Sariputra, just as one cannot smell the castor plant in a magnolia wood, but only the magnolia flowers, so, reverend Sariputra, living in this house, which is redolent with the perfume of the virtues of the Buddha-qualities, one does not smell the perfume of the disciples and the solitary sages. Reverend Sariputra, the Sakras, the Brahmas, the Lokapalas, the devas, nagas, yaksas, gandharvas, asuras, garudas, kimnaras, and mahoragas who live in this house hear the Dharma from the mouth of this holy man and, enticed by the perfume of the virtues of the Buddha-qualities, proceed to conceive the spirit of enlightenment.

Reverend Sariputra, I have been in this house for twelve years, and I have heard no discourses concerning the disciples and solitary sages but have heard only those concerning the great love, the great compassion, and the inconceivable qualities of the Buddha.

Reverend Sariputra, eight strange and wonderful things manifest themselves constantly in this house. What are these eight?

A light of golden hue shines here constantly, so bright that it is hard to distinguish day and night; and neither the moon nor the sun shines here distinctly. That is the first wonder of this house.

Furthermore, reverend Sariputra, whoever enters this house is no longer troubled by his passions from the moment he is within. That is the second strange and wonderful thing.

Furthermore, reverend Sariputra, this house is never forsaken by Sakra, Brahma, the Lokapalas, and the bodhisattvas from all the other buddha-fields. That is the third strange and wonderful thing.

Furthermore, reverend Sariputra, this house is never empty of the sounds of the Dharma, the discourse on the six transcendences, and the discourses of the irreversible wheel of the Dharma. That is the fourth strange and wonderful thing.

Furthermore, reverend Sariputra, in this house one always hears the rhythms, songs, and music of gods and men, and from this music constantly resounds the sound of the infinite Dharma of the Buddha. That is the fifth strange and wonderful thing.

Furthermore, reverend Sariputra, in this house there are always four inexhaustible treasures, replete with all kinds of jewels, which never decrease, although all the poor and wretched may partake to their satisfaction. That is the sixth strange and wonderful thing.

Furthermore, reverend Sariputra, at the wish of this good man, to this house come the innumerable Tathagatas of the ten directions, such as the Tathagatas Sakyamuni, Amitabha, Aksobhya, Ratnasri, Ratnarcis, Ratnacandra, Ratnavyuha, Dusprasaha, Sarvarthasiddha, Ratnabahula, Simhakirti, Simhasvara, and so forth; and when they come they teach the door of Dharma called the "Secrets of the Tathagatas" and then depart. That is the seventh strange and wonderful thing.

Furthermore, reverend Sariputra, all the splendors of the abodes of the gods and all the splendors of the fields of the Buddhas shine forth in this house. That is the eighth strange and wonderful thing.

Reverend Sariputra, these eight strange and wonderful things are seen in this house. Who then, seeing such inconceivable things, would believe the teaching of the disciples?

Sariputra: Goddess, what prevents you from transforming yourself out of your female state?

Goddess: Although I have sought my "female state" for these twelve years, I have not yet found it. Reverend Sariputra, if a magician were to incarnate a woman by magic, would you ask her, "What prevents you from transforming yourself out of your female state?"

Sariputra: No! Such a woman would not really exist, so what would there be to transform?

Goddess: Just so, reverend Sariputra, all things do not really exist. Now, would you think, "What prevents one whose nature is that of a magical incarnation from transforming herself out of her female state?"

Thereupon, the goddess employed her magical power to cause the elder Sariputra to appear in her form and to cause herself to appear in his form. Then the goddess, transformed into Sariputra, said to Sariputra, transformed into a goddess, "Reverend Sariputra, what prevents you from transforming yourself out of your female state?"

And Sariputra, transformed into the goddess, replied, "I no longer appear in the form of a male! My body has changed into the body of a woman! I do not know what to transform!"

The goddess continued, "If the elder could again change out of the female state, then all women could also change out of their female states. All women appear in the form of women in just the same way

as the elder appears in the form of a woman. While they are not women in reality, they appear in the form of women. With this in mind, the Buddha said, 'In all things, there is neither male nor female.'"

Then, the goddess released her magical power and each returned to his ordinary form. She then said to him, "Reverend Sariputra, what have you done with your female form?"

Sariputra: I neither made it nor did I change it.

Goddess: Just so, all things are neither made nor changed, and that they are not made and not changed, that is the teaching of the Buddha.

Sariputra: Goddess, where will you be born when you transmigrate after death?

Goddess: I will be born where all the magical incarnations of the Tathagata are born.

Sariputra: But the emanated incarnations of the Tathagata do not transmigrate nor are they born.

Goddess: All things and living beings are just the same; they do not transmigrate nor are they born!

Sariputra: Goddess, how soon will you attain the perfect enlightenment of Buddhahood?

Goddess: At such time as you, elder, become endowed once more with the qualities of an ordinary individual, then will I attain the perfect enlightenment of Buddhahood.

Sariputra: Goddess, it is impossible that I should become endowed once more with the qualities of an ordinary individual.

Goddess: Just so, reverend Sariputra, it is impossible that I should attain the perfect enlightenment of Buddhahood! Why? Because perfect enlightenment stands upon the impossible. Because it is impossible, no one attains the perfect enlightenment of Buddhahood.

Sariputra: But the Tathagata has declared: "The Tathagatas, who are as numerous as the sands of the Ganges, have attained perfect Buddhahood, are attaining perfect Buddhahood, and will go on attaining perfect Buddhahood."

Goddess: Reverend Sariputra, the expression, "the Buddhas of the past, present and future," is a conventional expression made up of a certain number of syllables. The Buddhas are neither past, nor present, nor future. Their enlightenment transcends the three times! But tell me, elder, have you attained sainthood?

Sariputra: It is attained, because there is no attainment.

Goddess: Just so, there is perfect enlightenment because there is no attainment of

perfect enlightenment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: How appearances arise

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am not basing it on the evidence of just one set of sense organs. I am basing this on the two things, the fact that we all recognize the distinction between erroneous and nonerroneous cognitions of appearance, these things being mere matters of fact and not disputable, and the example I used, the anatomy of rods and cones in the eye.

gad rgyangs said:

we recognize shared expectations of common experiences, but this does not address whether we see things as they are or not. If there is nothing but those shared expectations and common experiences, then why claim they are not what they seem to be?

Malcolm wrote:

If things are as they seem to be, there would be no basis of error for anyone at anytime, anywhere.

gad rgyangs said:

Ok, this is the third extreme; something which neither exists nor does not exist. This does not even get past the gate of Madhyamaka.

I didn't say "it neither exists nor does not exist" I said it is beyond such categories. big difference.

Malcolm wrote:

Then you cannot talk about it at all in anyway. You cannot even say what it is. You cannot even say there is a basis.

gad rgyangs said:

Plato and Psuedo-Dionysus have no role in this discussion. Whatever they were talking about, it was not Dzogchen nor the basis.

the Dzogchen basis is a metaphor pointing to the nature of reality, and so are the metaphors of Plato and Pseudo-Dionysius.

Malcolm wrote:

As far as I am concerned, Plato is an eternalist, as are all his followers. I have no interest in Plato.

gad rgyangs said:

This is only a problem for those who think the basis is something more than a generic set of qualities.

qualities of what? your consciousness? then you are claiming that your consciousness is the basis of the basis, which makes no sense.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

We do not say the basis only has an conscious aspect, it also has an emptiness aspect. That is one of the qualities of the basis.

By pointing that the basis is a generic set of qualities, Dzogchen is stating that the basis is one's own consciousness, out of which one's afflictive reality is constructed by ignorance (ma rig pa), and deconstructed by knowledge (rig pa).

If you claim, as you are doing, that the basis is some kind of ineffable ground of being, this is contradicts not only the teaching of Dzogchen, but the teaching of the Buddha in toto. (and yes, peanut gallery, I am aware that there are some translators of Dzogchen texts who have taken the ill-advised route of importing terms from Christian theology into their translations, endlessly confusing students who read such texts and leading them far away from the teachings of Dzogchen in the process).

That is fine with me, but do not describe your theories as "Dzogchen," since they have nothing to do with Dzogchen at all, and have more in common with Christian Theology and so on

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 2:53 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Our Dalai Lama made the 3rd Ground "claim that it is so" - in his Foreword.

Malcolm wrote:

It is still just a claim.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Arya Asanga, a Third Ground bodhisattva, says in his Bodhisattvabhumi that women cannot reach annutarasamyaksambodhi. Because they have too many mental afflictions and inferior wisdom.

During the first of the three big kalpas bodhisattvas use female bodies if they wish, but after that time period (a mere 10 to the 59th power years) the use only male bodies. So women can become great bodhisattvas, but not full Buddhas.

See Engle's new translation The Bodhisattva Path to Unsurpassed Enlightenment, pp 169-70.

Malcolm wrote:

If there was ever proof that Ārya bodhisattvas possess knowledge obscurations, this is it.

Nicholas Weeks said:

Darn - maybe if he was an 5th or an 8th Grounder? But Malcolm knows better.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, in order to be free of knowledge obscurations, he would have to be a buddha, actually. Anyway, we do not really know that Asanga was a bodhisattva on the stages, apart from someone's claim that it is so.

I think may a visit to Vimalakirti's house might be in order for Asanga. I think Yeshe Tsogyal and Mandarava might have a thing or two to say about women's wisdom being "inferior."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Arya Asanga, a Third Ground bodhisattva, says in his Bodhisattvabhumi that women cannot reach annutarasamyaksambodhi. Because they have too many mental afflictions and inferior wisdom.

During the first of the three big kalpas bodhisattvas use female bodies if they wish, but after that time period (a mere 10 to the 59th power years) the use only male bodies. So women can become great bodhisattvas, but not full Buddhas.

See Engle's new translation The Bodhisattva Path to Unsurpassed Enlightenment, pp 169-70.

Malcolm wrote:

If there was ever proof that Ārya bodhisattvas possess knowledge obscurations, this is it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: How appearances arise

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

you're not understanding his point: you cannot prove the subjectivity of our perceptions based on a description of sense organs, since you only know about sense organs by using your sense organs. If their representations are not "seeing things as they are" (your words) then they cannot be the basis for a reliable description of the sense process which you then attempt to use to prove that appearances are not "seeing things as they are".

Malcolm wrote:

Sure you can. I just did. If you wish to dispute the anatomy of hearing, seeing, and so on. Please go ahead. But your argument also injures your own point, you have no basis for refuting any claim that "we are not seeing things as they are."

gad rgyangs said:

you cannot base a claim that "we are not seeing things as they are" on the evidence of sense organs since they themselves are perceptions which you claim are not seen as they are. Its really not complicated.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not basing it on the evidence of just one set of sense organs. I am basing this on the two things, the fact that we all recognize the distinction between erroneous and nonerroneous cognitions of appearance, these things being mere matters of fact and not disputable, and the example I used, the anatomy of rods and cones in the eye.

gad rgyangs said:

Ok, so now you are subscribing to the extreme, "the basis isn't anything at all," also rejected by the Dzogchen tantras. For you the basis must be inert, insentient. Something like a void.

no, it is simply beyond the categories of existing or not existing. This is not complicated either, and has been well understood even in the west since Plato and Pseudo-Dionysius.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, this is the third extreme; something which neither exists nor does not exist. This does not even get past the gate of Madhyamaka.

Plato and Psuedo-Dionysus have no role in this discussion. Whatever they were talking about, it was not Dzogchen nor the basis.

gad rgyangs said:

a basis that has a conscious aspect that is responsible for manifestation (through which all things were made): how is this different from the hypostases of Plotinus or even the christian trinity?

Malcolm wrote:

This is only a problem for those who think the basis is something more than a generic set of qualities. In any case, while you may wish to dispute what Dzogchen teachings actually say, I wish merely to understand what they actually say and practice them accordingly (and yes, what I report is what Dzogchen tantras and commentaries actually say).

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: How appearances arise

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Which is related to bdag nyid gcig pa'i ma rig pa, yes? Which Dzogchen texts discuss this?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is related to the imputing ignorance (kun rtags ma rig pa).

monktastic said:

Interesting. From the section that florin (thanks!) suggested I read:

The natural creative power (rtsal) of awareness has actually created a veil whereby awareness is obscured— on account of which, one speaks of an “ignorance that has the same nature (as awareness)” (bdag nyid gcig pa'i ma rig pa).

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is because consciousness/knowing (shes pa/rig pa) is not aware of its appearances at this point in the game, since they have not manifested yet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: How appearances arise

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is basic anatomy, something of which Nietzsche was ignorant.

gad rgyangs said:

you're not understanding his point: you cannot prove the subjectivity of our perceptions

based on a description of sense organs, since you only know about sense organs by using your sense organs. If their representations are not "seeing things as they are" (your words) then they cannot be the basis for a reliable description of the sense process which you then attempt to use to prove that appearances are not "seeing things as they are".

Malcolm wrote:

Sure you can. I just did. If you wish to dispute the anatomy of hearing, seeing, and so on. Please go ahead. But your argument also injures your own point, you have no basis for refuting any claim that "we are not seeing things as they are."

gad rgyangs said:

I see, well, you seem to subscribe to the "basis can be anything at all" extreme. how can it "be" anything at all when it is not an existent thing?

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, so now you are subscribing to the extreme, "the basis isn't anything at all," also rejected by the Dzogchen tantras. For you the basis must be inert, insentient. Something like a void.

gad rgyangs said:

The consciousness aspect of the basis, which does not recognize its appearances as its own state. (do we really have to do this again?)
are you saying the basis has consciousness or the basis is consciousness? If the basis has consciousness, you have reified it. If you say it simply is consciousness, then you are a cittamatrix.

Malcolm wrote:

You decide. The texts state pretty clearly that the basis has a conscious aspect (and in other places that it is an unfabricated consciousness), which we normally term both lhun grub and thugs rje, depending which level we are discussing. Both are considered the basis for delusion. Ka dag, on the other hand, since it never partakes in appearance, can never be a basis for delusion.

The reason that it is said that the basis has a conscious (shes pa) aspect is to provide an explanation of how there is rig pa and ma rig pa, and how ma rig pa then generates dualistic consciousness (rnam shes), and so on.

If you wish to consider the primary teaching of Dzogchen to be reifying the basis, that is ok with me. Whatever Dzogchen you are then following is not the Dzogchen of the sgra thal gyur and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 9th, 2016 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: How appearances arise

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For example, there are no colors in external objects. Colors are something imputed by our minds from images generated by the rods and cones in our eyes which select wave lengths of something we call "light," a kind of radiation which fall on objects. We see colors, but there are no colors.

gad rgyangs said:

thats a whole lot of suppositions. Even Nietzsche knew better:

Malcolm wrote:

It is basic anatomy, something of which Nietzsche was ignorant.

gad rgyangs said:

What is the basis? Is it inert? Is it sentient? Is it one thing? Is it many things?
none of the above.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, well, you seem to subscribe to the "basis can be anything at all" extreme.

gad rgyangs said:

The basis does not manifest a you or a me. For example, if you think the basis is original purity, you are already deluded.

so what does manifest you and me? if you say "delusion" or "ignorance" then, what manifests delusion? You can't say us, that would be circular reasoning.

Malcolm wrote:

The consciousness aspect of the basis, which does not recognize its appearances as its own state. (do we really have to do this again?)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2016 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: How appearances arise

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When it is said that appearances are illusions and delusions, this means that we are not seeing things as they are.

gad rgyangs said:

how do you know you are not seeing things as they are?

Malcolm wrote:

For example, there are no colors in external objects. Colors are something imputed by

our minds from images generated by the rods and cones in our eyes which select wave lengths of something we call "light," a kind of radiation which fall on objects. We see colors, but there are no colors.

gad rgyangs said:

Of course they are "just manifestations," but manifestations of what?
the basis. gzhi snang.

Malcolm wrote:

What is the basis? Is it inert? Is it sentient? Is it one thing? Is it many things?

gad rgyangs said:

Who is deluded and why? What is wrong with pejorative terms? Do we need to create a Dzogchen safe space where no pejorative terms are used in case someone might think their "manifestations" are negative and suffer from a poor self-image as a result?
you are deluded if you believe you are deluded. Since "you" are also a manifestation of the basis, what purpose does it serve to call it "deluded"?

Malcolm wrote:

The basis does not manifest a you or a me. For example, if you think the basis is original purity, you are already deluded.

gad rgyangs said:

pejorative terms are evidence of attachment and aversion, picking and choosing, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Then Dzogchen tantras must be full of attachment and aversion.

gad rgyangs said:

there is nowhere that is not a Dzogchen safe space.

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently, where ever there is attachment and aversion is not a safe space in your Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2016 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

i know the tradition tries very hard to define conventional reality correctly perceived as opposed to mistaken sense cognition, but I dont think its so clear cut about any kind of so called reality.

Malcolm wrote:

Rongzom agrees and so do I. Delusion is delusion. There is no point in creating degrees

of more deluded and less deluded, just as no one is half-pregnant.

gad rgyangs said:

the only difference between saying "everything is an illusion/delusion" and "everything that manifests, manifests" is a value judgment in the case of "illusion" "delusion" since those are basically pejorative terms. If we just say that waking reality, dreams, and illusions are just manifestations, then we do not have to commit to such an indulgence in attachment and aversion.

Malcolm wrote:

Redirect:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=22223#p337047>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2016 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: How appearances arise

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

i know the tradition tries very hard to define conventional reality correctly perceived as opposed to mistaken sense cognition, but I dont think its so clear cut about any kind of so called reality.

Malcolm wrote:

Rongzom agrees and so do I. Delusion is delusion. There is no point in creating degrees of more deluded and less deluded, just as no one is half-pregnant.

gad rgyangs said:

the only difference between saying "everything is an illusion/delusion" and "everything that manifests, manifests" is a value judgment in the case of "illusion" "delusion" since those are basically pejorative terms. If we just say that waking reality, dreams, and illusions are just manifestations, then we do not have to commit to such an indulgence in attachment and aversion.

Malcolm wrote:

When it is said that appearances are illusions and delusions, this means that we are not seeing things as they are. Of course they are "just manifestations," but manifestations of what? Who is deluded and why? What is wrong with pejorative terms? Do we need to create a Dzogchen safe space where no pejorative terms are used in case someone might think their "manifestations" are negative and suffer from a poor self-image as a result?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2016 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

i know the tradition tries very hard to define conventional reality correctly perceived as opposed to mistaken sense cognition, but I dont think its so clear cut about any kind of so called reality.

Malcolm wrote:

Rongzom agrees and so do I. Delusion is delusion. There is no point in creating degrees of more deluded and less deluded, just as no one is half-pregnant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2016 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: How appearances arise

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In Dzogchen, it is described in the topic of how sentient beings become deluded.

tomamundsen said:

Which is related to bdag nyid gcig pu'i ma rig pa, yes? Which Dzogchen texts discuss this?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is related to the imputing ignorance (kun rtags ma rig pa). The Ignorance of the same identity simply means that one's consciousness is unaware of itself. The connate ignorance arises the moment there is movement in that consciousness, which manifest as "colors." If that movement is recognizes as one's own state, then one becomes Samantabhadra. If not, then one moves into the third ignorance, the connate ignorance.

Zhang Zhung snyan rgyud and some Buddhist schemes, such as the dgongs pa zang thal, do not mention the ignorance of the same identity.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2016 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

an illusory elephant in a dream can haul wood and bear a rider.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, an illusory elephant in a dream can haul dream wood and bear a dream rider, can also converse fluently in 13 languages aside from Elephantise, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2016 at 9:36 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As far as the illusion itself goes, we can say that it depends on causes and conditions, but these also cannot withstand analysis and will be found to be unproduced as well. So in the end, everything winds up being illusion, and therefore, unproduced.

Astus said:

The elephant is illusory, just as causality. Illusory means apparent, functional, and at the same time insubstantial, empty.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean the illusory elephant can haul wood? Bear a rider?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2016 at 6:38 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When it is understood that the illusion of an elephant is not an elephant, there is no concept of elephant to eliminate. One knows an elephant never existed where one seemed previously to appear. That elephant is self-liberated.

Astus said:

There is still an illusion, isn't there? Or do you mean by self-liberation a total nothingness?

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that the elephant in the illusion was never produced.

As far as the illusion itself goes, we can say that it depends on causes and conditions, but these also cannot withstand analysis and will be found to be unproduced as well. So in the end, everything winds up being illusion, and therefore, unproduced.

Astus said:

But your contention is that we do not experience objects.

That doesn't sound like what I said.

But according to you, there must be a cause of that consciousness.

I think this got mixed up because of terminology. I only used the word consciousness to compare it to the 18 dhatu scheme, to show that experiences precedes subject and object. On the other hand, I debate an independent consciousness, because that is an absolutist version of subject, while even the subject itself is an abstraction from experience.

Malcolm wrote:
[/quote]

The eighteen dhātu scheme demonstrates nothing of the sort. It shows, or intends to show, that consciousnesses are a product of the meeting of a sense organ and a sense object. It is elaborated to show that experience is derived from subject and object, not that it precedes it.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2016 at 4:29 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So you subscribe to the third extreme then — that there can be something both existent and nonexistent. Because in reality, production and nonproduction are mutually exclusive.

Astus said:

No. Production is a concept to navigate within experiences. Non-production is a concept to eliminate attachment. The point is to be active and free at the same time. Do you consider that a contradiction?

Malcolm wrote:

I consider production and nonproduction to be mutually exclusive. There is one or the other. There cannot be both. For example, in the illusion of elephant an elephant is never produced. Such an elephant never arises. The illusory elephant can never become an elephant. It never was an elephant. The illusion of an elephant is strictly a non-elephant now.

When it is understood that the illusion of an elephant is not an elephant, there is no concept of elephant to eliminate. One knows an elephant never existed where one seemed previously to appear. That elephant is self-liberated. If you use nonproduction as a concept to eliminate attachments, you will never be free from attachments. Why? Because you are still stuck in concepts and dualism.

Astus said:

So if I poke my finger in your eye, you will not experience my finger as an object, distinct from your eye?

Both finger and eye exist as experiences. To that basis comes all the qualifications.

Malcolm wrote:

But your contention is that we do not experience objects.

Astus said:

If there are no objects, how can there consciousness of "something?"

Consciousness means there an instance of experience, a phenomenon. That is, an instance of seeing a vase is first a "vase-phenomenon" that is divided into a vase as object and a viewer as subject.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

But according to you, there must be a cause of that consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2016 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So, production is not real and nonproduction is real, correct?

Astus said:

They form a single reality together.

Malcolm wrote:

So you subscribe to the third extreme then — that there can be something both existent and nonexistent. Because in reality, production and nonproduction are mutually exclusive.

Astus said:

in order for there to be an eye consciousness, there has to be an external object, a form, of which that consciousness is aware

Not exactly. What I say is that when there is consciousness, it is consciousness of something. Even more precisely, there are only experiences, and they can be theoretically separated into subject and object, but that's an added distinction, and not something experienced.

Malcolm wrote:

So if I poke my finger in your eye, you will not experience my finger as an object, distinct from your eye?

Astus said:

To put that into the dhatu version, there are instances of consciousness, and it can be then imagined to be objects and senses.

Malcolm wrote:

If there are no objects, how can there consciousness of "something?"

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2016 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Our Pristine Mind - Orgyen Chowang's new book

Content:

Punya said:

What I don't like is marketing the Dharma.

From my worm's eye view, it just doesn't seem like marketing spin with this teacher. And the message that we look for happiness in all the wrong places is not a bad one. 84000 methods and all that.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no happiness in samsara. Not even a needle's breadth.

It is not his fault that Americans are "desperately seeking Susan."

First world problems...anyway, it is not my point to criticize OC, but rather point out how transparent and consumer oriented marketing of Dharma books is. I think Trungpa had a good term for it, "spiritual materialism."

Perhaps I should just accept that we live in a spiritually superficial culture...

```
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: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 8th, 2016 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Our Pristine Mind - Orgyen Chowang's new book

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Anyway, as I said, I have met this teacher, and I like him.

What I don't like is marketing the Dharma. Thank goodness he did not put a Buddha or some teacher on the cover of his new book. That is a practice I find particularly abhorrent.

And you should by my book, Buddhahood in This Life, when it is released by Wisdom

next December.

Yes, florin, it is understood that you do not like me. It's ok.

In this case, I was responding to a specific question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2016 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So, production is not real and nonproduction is real, correct?

smcj said:

Does anyone else think we should abandon the word "real"? I personally like "valid" or "authentic" better. There's less connotation of physicality.

Malcolm wrote:

That is actually the point, Astus has been maintaining all along that, for example, in order for there to be an eye consciousness, there has to be an external object, a form, of which that consciousness is aware. You can make all kinds of claims about how ephemeral that form is, how it is a product of causes and conditions, and so on., but it is still a kind of realism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2016 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Our Pristine Mind - Orgyen Chowang's new book

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Now, now, Malcolm, your kleshas are showing.

Malcolm wrote:

Just one big bundle of kleshas, I guess.

Anyway, as I said, I have met this teacher, and I like him.

What I don't like is marketing the Dharma. Thank goodness he did not put a Buddha or some teacher on the cover of his new book. That is a practice I find particularly abhorrent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2016 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Then it does not any sense to say that things arise from cause and condition, because as Mañjuśrimitra points out, they are nondual in the mind.

Astus said:

It is the apparent production and the ultimate non-production that are non-dual, so it is conditionality that means the absence of substance, and emptiness that exists only as illusoriness of phenomena.

Malcolm wrote:

So, production is not real and nonproduction is real, correct?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2016 at 8:55 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Astus said:

...but the functioning of consciousness cannot be unconditioned, because being aware of things is a conditioned occurrence.

Malcolm wrote:

So in terms of conditioned occurrences, their arising, abiding and perishing must be established. So how are you going to establish this? As conventions? That is fine, but a "convention" refers to an imputation and a reification.

Astus said:

...But I think you as well like to emphasise the non-duality of the two truths. And that singularity, where there are appearances without establishment, where consciousness and emptiness are inseparable, is all there is.

Malcolm wrote:

Then it does not any sense to say that things arise from cause and condition, because as Mañjuśrimitra points out, they are nondual in the mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2016 at 8:21 PM

Title: Re: Our Pristine Mind - Orgyen Chowang's new book

Content:

Lhasa said:

Somebody has got to teach the 'Barnes&Noble-Starbucks-Yuppie-Yogi' crowd. I saw this Lama live on TWR's stream last year.

He has no problem transmitting through a computer screen. My computer rebooted

itself right in the middle of his teaching. He is very powerful. And in his introduction to this book, he talks about language and how what he was teaching got mangled using a translator, how he learned English and searched for a way to use words that convey his intent and connected to those he was teaching. This is not fluff.

Malcolm wrote:

I was primarily reacting to the titles of his public talks and what not, not to his book.

Even so, it seems that many Lamas feels compelled to do "a book," because if they don't, they won't reach any students.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2016 at 8:02 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

AlexMcLeod said:

I think they are confusing lack of "thoughts" with lack of ability to have an intention.

Sherab Dorje said:

Intentions are not thoughts?

smcj said:

Is bodhicitta a "thought"? I don't know, just asking.

Malcolm wrote:

At the level of Mahāyāna, yes, it refers to the motivation to attain buddhahood for the benefit of all sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2016 at 8:02 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Astus said:

...but the functioning of consciousness cannot be unconditioned, because being aware of things is a conditioned occurrence.

Malcolm wrote:

So in terms of conditioned occurrences, their arising, abiding and perishing must be established. So how are you going to establish this? As conventions? That is fine, but a "convention" refers to an imputation and a reification.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2016 at 9:17 AM

Title: Re: Our Pristine Mind - Orgyen Chowang's new book

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I met Orgyen Chowang when he first came to the US, back in 1998.

But it seems that now his teachings are the usual pap for the Barnes and Nobles crowd.

Frankly, it gets a bit nauseating to see Dharma teaching after Dharma teaching such as:

Happiness Depends On Your Mind

Cultivating The Power of Love and Compassion

The Way of Living: Ten Principles to Attract Positive Circumstances Into Your Life

etc.

I guess people in the US are just not attracted to teachings such as:

Razor which Destroys at a Touch

Shock and Awe

Severance

Taking out the Red Channel of Life.

etc.

Dont get me wrong, I think OC is a super nice person. It just troubles me to see someone so educated catering to such new age tripe.

Dharma just isn't about happiness in this life at all. Anyone who thinks it is, isn't practicing Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2016 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: What to do about Daesh? (ISIS, ISIL...)

Content:

MiphamFan said:

Please read ChNN as well as Sam van Schaik's work on pre-Buddhist Tibet. There was no systematized religion which was displaced....

Malcolm wrote:

That is not really correct, in my opinion. We just don't have good records of that period due to the amazing feat of cultural amnesia the Tibetan managed to pull off.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2016 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: What to do about Daesh? (ISIS, ISIL...)

Content:

MiphamFan said:

I judge Islam based on its role in the destruction of Buddhism in India, Central Asia and Southeast Asia.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think you can really blame Islam for this. You should read:

Buddhism and Islam on the Silk Road (Encounters with Asia), Elverskog, Johan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2016 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You apparently did not read this sutta carefully. Sariputta enters and exits each dhyāna before proceeding to the next one.

Astus said:

Please point me to the line you think means that.

Malcolm wrote:

"Furthermore, with the complete transcending of the dimension of nothingness, Sariputta entered & remained in the dimension of neither perception nor non-perception. He emerged mindfully from that attainment. On emerging mindfully from that attainment, he regarded the past qualities that had ceased & changed: 'So this is how these qualities, not having been, come into play. Having been, they vanish.' He remained unattracted & unrepelled with regard to those qualities, independent, detached, released, dissociated, with an awareness rid of barriers. He discerned that 'There is a further escape,' and pursuing it there really was for him.[4]

"Furthermore, with the complete transcending of the dimension of neither perception nor non-perception, Sariputta entered & remained in the cessation of feeling & perception. Seeing with discernment, his fermentations were totally ended. He emerged mindfully from that attainment. On emerging mindfully from that attainment, he regarded the past qualities that had ceased & changed: 'So this is how these qualities, not having been, come into play. Having been, they vanish.' He remained unattracted & unrepelled with regard to those qualities, independent, detached, released, dissociated, with an awareness rid of barriers. He discerned that 'There is no further escape,' and pursuing it there really wasn't for him. Now, it does not say this for each dhyāna, only for the third and forth formless dhyānas. However, I think it is fair to say that it applies to all, because otherwise you have give a complicated explanation for why this is not said of the first six, etc.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2016 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Astus said:

Also, if you look at the description in the

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.111.than.html>, Sariputra goes through the 8 jhanas, and only following nirodha-samapatti does he emerges from it and reflects. And that's quite logical, since in nirodha both feeling and perception stops, but not before that. And if you look into the other texts describing the sequence, it goes deeper and deeper, it's not that they always have to stop and go back.

Malcolm wrote:

You apparently did not read this sutta carefully. Sariputra enters and exits each dhyāna before proceeding to the next one.

I don't pay that much attention to what modern Theravadins say about meditation because they lost their lineage and reconstructed it from books.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2016 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: What to do about Daesh? (ISIS, ISIL...)

Content:

MiphamFan said:

Abh Bakr al-Baghdadi has a PhD in Islamic studies. This guy is a Muslim who emphasizes the role of (a certain interpretation of) Islam in the role of ISIL which is just as justified as that of mainstream Islamic jurisprudence:

http://www.aymennjawad.org/?switch_site_version=normal

Malcolm wrote:

The issue is not whether ISIS represents a strand of Islamic thinking. It does. The point is that most people who are in ISIS have very little knowledge of Islam.

Whether or not it is as "justified" as other interpretations of Islam I will leave for Muslims to sort out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2016 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: What to do about Daesh? (ISIS, ISIL...)

Content:

Fa Dao said:

why is no one taking into consideration islamist ideology as a causative factor? Why is it so hard to believe that there are people that whole-heartedly believe in that ideology?

ISIS isn't just made up of people who are pissed off poor people who blame the west for their situation. There are huge numbers of them who are educated and come from middle class and above socio-economic backgrounds.

Malcolm wrote:

These people generally have a very poor understanding of their own religion, just as most Buddhists do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, May 7th, 2016 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Right, this kind of one pointedness never abandon vitarka and vicara. It is essentially the first dhyāna or perfect śamatha.

Astus said:

Not necessarily. As I read the suttas, change from one jhana to another happens by recognition that the present mental factors are troubling. Then either one realises the true nature of appearances and abandons it all (i.e. nirvana) completely, or goes to the next level. It seems logical to me that unless there is a level of awareness, such a shift from one jhana to another could not happen. So, there is indeed correct samadhi and incorrect samadhi.

Malcolm wrote:

Shifts between dhyānas cannot deliberately happen after the second dhyāna. There can only be a deliberate shift through the remaining dhyānas by exiting one and then entering another. Because of the absence of vitarka in the second dhyāna on up, we then have the notion of so called "access concentrations."

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 6th, 2016 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

The Cicada said:

Apparently there were only around 6 months between the death of Patton and the birth of Trump....

Malcolm wrote:

Then it is quite impossible for Trump to be the reincarnation of Patton.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 6th, 2016 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Astus said:

He mentions development of jhanas to some extent, like in Detachment Within Activity on p 298-299.

In The Path in Harmony on p 316 he talks about the dangers of deep samadhi and that one should just go with access concentration. Then on the next page:

"So, there can be right samadhi and wrong samadhi. Wrong samadhi is where the mind enters calm and there's no awareness at all. One could sit for two hours or even all day but the mind doesn't know where it's been or what's happened. It doesn't know anything. There is calm, but that's all. It's like a well-sharpened knife which we don't bother to put to any use. This is a deluded type of calm, because there is not much self-awareness. The meditator may think he has reached the ultimate already, so he doesn't bother to look for anything else. Samadhi can be an enemy at this level. Wisdom can not arise because there is no awareness of right and wrong.

With right samadhi, no matter what level of calm is reached, there is awareness. There is full mindfulness and clear comprehension. This is the samadhi which can give rise to wisdom, one can not get lost in it. Practitioners should understand this well. You can't do without this awareness, it must be present from beginning to end. This kind of samadhi has no danger."

Malcolm wrote:

Right, this kind of one pointedness never abandon vitarka and vicara. It is essentially the first dhyāna or perfect śamatha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 6th, 2016 at 7:40 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For every capacity there is a different assertion,
for every mentality there is a different vehicle,
and for every vehicle there is a different philosophy.
For example, it is like an elephant
seen by the blind;
or the individual endearment every relative has
for a man or a woman;
or when a single barberry bush on a mountain pass
appears to be nine;
or the way six realms see different appearances

in a single instance of water.
— The Blazing Clear Dimension Tantra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, May 6th, 2016 at 7:36 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

catmoon said:

Thanks to all for your patience. At least now I can see the nut we are trying to crack.

First Problem

If there is an unconditioned mind, then it is beginningless, causeless.

If it's beginningless. it exists now.

If my mind is not pristine, its current state is conditioned, caused.

Therefore two minds exist and I am schizophrenic or something.

Malcolm wrote:

Time is not something real, therefore, this qualm does not apply [conditioned entities can only exist in time].

catmoon said:

Second Problem

Prior to enlightenment the Buddha's mind was not pristine.

After enlightenment it presumably was pristine.

Since this pristine mind could not have arisen without the prior existence of the conditioned mind...

The pristine mind is conditioned. If the pristine mind did not arise, but is present from beginningless time, we're back to problem 1.

I'm not trying to put these ideas forward as truth. I'm just trying to state the problems clearly.

Malcolm wrote:

Time is not something real, therefore, this qualm also does not apply.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2016 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: Differences in after life experiences all over the world

Content:

Nosta said:

All over the world, there are differences between the accounts of the after death visions. For example, christians may see Jesus; tibetans and some buddhists cultures will see wrathful gods or beautiful bodhisattvas.

If, as some lamas/Tibetan book of deads/ say, in the bardo we see the wrathful and benevolent deities, why do westerners not see them? I mean, if the bardo of death was really like the Tibetan Book of Dead describes, everybody would experience - among other things - that stuff related to deities. But we don't see that on westerner descriptions of after life experiences.

Malcolm wrote:

This is because they have not received the empowerment of the peaceful and wrathful deities, and have not done this practice, so when they experience the sounds, lights and rays of the bardo of dharmatā, they just experience it as a confusing kaleidoscopic cacophony. Not only this, but the bardo passes in a flash for ordinary sentient beings who have not engaged in any kind of contemplative practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2016 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Astus said:

As a potential it means that the tathagatagarbha teaching is only about raising spirits and trying to convince people who are afraid of prajnaparamita.

Malcolm wrote:

That is certainly true of the way it is presented in the Lankāvatāra, but that is not how it is presented in the ten tathāgatagarbha sūtras.

In the latter sūtras, it is presented as the dharmakāya encased within afflictions, similar with butter in milk, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2016 at 9:05 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

catmoon said:

If the unconditioned mind arises from the conditioned mind.... then maybe it isn't unconditioned? At any rate there is no need for "both minds" to exist simultaneously.

Pristine mind is a pretty concept but man there are some tricky problems attending it. Are we on the same page now? Getting closer?

Astus said:

It doesn't arise from anything, since it's not something to arise or disappear, so in that sense it is unconditioned. But as long as it's presented as if there were an "it" or "something", it keeps generating this misinterpretation of an ultimate object or subject, while the whole point is to realise the lack of substances.

Malcolm wrote:

Pristine consciousness (jñāna) is the dharmatā of the mind or the cittatā of citta, inseparable clarity and emptiness.

Astus said:

To me, unfabricated sounds better than unconditioned, because fabrication implies active doing, while conditioning is being subject to something.

Malcolm wrote:

It is both unfabricated and unconditioned.

I have already shown above that cause and condition is incoherent with respect the mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2016 at 5:26 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When no characteristics are perceived, that is called "perceiving emptiness."

Astus said:

That's a good example of figurative speech.

"All things that have characteristics are false and ephemeral. If you see all characteristics to be non-characteristics, then you see the Tathāgata."
(http://www.acmuller.net/bud-canon/diamond_sutra.html, ch 5)

Malcolm wrote:

There is no correspondence between what the Tibetan text says and this translation into Chinese.

The Tibetan renders it as follows:

The perfect [32] marks are only false. In so far as the perfect [32] marks do not exist, they are not false. As such, one should see the marks and absence of marks on the Tathāgata.

You really should learn Tibetan.

Astus said:

[Yes, and this is why we can say that pristine consciousness is unconditioned
Again, figuratively speaking.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not figurative. It can be taken literally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2016 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

florin said:

"Sattvavajra is our ordinary analitical-judgemental presence inside time which depends upon cause and effect

"Kunjed Gyalpo is our timeless pure perfect presence beyond cause and effect " JV.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, I completely disagree with this. This is not how these things are explained in Dzogchen exegesis, nor how they are to be understood.

The nidāna or gleng gzhi is a major topic of importance in understanding Dzogchen tantras.

As Shenphen Ozer writes in the beginning of the commentary on this text:

In that respect, not saying "[Thus have I] heard [at one time]" is a superiority over the common vehicles in which the teacher and the retinue appear as separate. Here, the powerful scholar vidyādhara of the past have said this [Thus did I explain at one time] is a phrase which shows the teacher and retinue to be inseparable.

There is even a citation from the Kun byed rgyal po itself which contradicts your assertion:

I have always been Kulyarāja.

Having made the teacher, the teaching, the retinue and the time,
the teacher of the teachers is also made by me.

The teaching is the explanation of my nature.

After the retinue is the arising of my essence,
the time and place are my nature.

That tantra is the Kulayarāja which explains my nature,
aside from which there is not even a single Dharma that is explained which is not mine.
Vimalamitra expands upon this further:

The perfection of place is dharmatā free from proliferation, not established through any characteristic and not established within the experiential range of words and syllables.
Since the teacher (the mode of the existence of things) does not exist even as a word

upon which proliferation is based, he is not established in terms of faces and hands because he is not established as a nominal proliferation. The perfect retinue for such a teacher is the self-originated [rang byung], self-arisen [rang shar] display of dharmatā. The perfect teaching for such a retinue is one's own vidyā, the ultimate teaching — though it originates, it is self-originated; though it arises, it is self-arisen without being created by any cause or condition; and it is free from arising and perishing. Though it is present pervading all, its characteristic cannot be understood by anyone. As such, since place, teacher, retinue and the Dharma to be explained meet in the natural reality of things, the perfect time is called "without beginning or end." The setting for this tantra is beyond time, and both the teacher and retinue are also beyond time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2016 at 2:46 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Astus said:

Is there such a thing as emptiness to perceive?

"This is a perfection of what is not, because space is not something that is."
(PP8000 9.4, tr Conze; T8n227v4p553a25)

Malcolm wrote:

When no characteristics are perceived, that is called "perceiving emptiness."

Astus said:

Dzogchen is the state of prajñāpāramita.

It looks like that prajnaparamita is a big common factor among all Mahayana schools.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and this is why we can say that pristine consciousness is unconditioned:

The mind that clings to entities and clings to cause and result

itself appears as cause and condition, but because those are nondual, there is no arising and perishing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2016 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

florin said:

So again whoever tells you that it is only about the basis in itself without any instructions aimed at practitioners that want to practically apply the principles of

section 1 and 2 is mistaken.

Malcolm wrote:

It is principally about the view. The view is principally about the basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, May 5th, 2016 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

florin said:

No. The text addresses those who don't understand. And those who don't 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 practitioners that want to practically apply the principles of section 1 and 2 is mistaken.

Malcolm wrote:

Sattvavajra is not someone who does not understand. Sattvavajra, the retinue of vidyā, is the emanation of the dharmakāya Kulyarāja. This tantra only has an uncommon nidāna or introduction. It has no common nidāna. I.e, it has "This at one time did I explain" and no "Thus at one time did I hear." This means that the teacher and the retinue are the same continuum.

The three prajñās are the basis of all Buddhist paths: hearing, reflection and meditation. But of course the text says:

Since the transcendent state of I, Kulyarāja,
is beyond objects of reflection, it cannot be meditated.
Of course this is the case. It must be experienced.

But of course, in the commentary on chapter 78, Shenphen Ozer cites Padmasambhava:

Though the view is higher than the sky,
the cause and result of karma is finer than flour.
M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 11:56 PM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

florin said:

They are empty luminous expressions of primordial potentiality and understood as such.

Malcolm wrote:

Is there something that isn't? And if not, why isn't looking at a rock just as effective as looking at luminosities?

florin said:

Working with the luminosities is far superior to that of working with the temporal tsal energies of primordial state because one works with the real essence of the state rather than its temporal manifestation.

Malcolm wrote:

The simpler way to put it is that one cannot attain rainbow body by working with karmically solidified vision which arises from traces. One needs to work with so called "appearances of primordial wisdom (pristine consciousness)."

All appearances initially arise from the (unrecognized) potentiality (rtsal) of compassion (thugs rjes) because this corresponds with what ordinary sentient beings are able to see (i.e., the nirmanakāya), and this is why thugs rje corresponds with the nirmanakāya.

In other words, we are only able to perceive a portion of the basis, with which we are not integrated due to our ignorance. The path allows us to remove that ignorance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

florin said:

Of course there is no progress because there is no mental cultivation based on effort but there is manifestation of the body of light by stably resting in the primordial state while working with the luminosities.

Malcolm wrote:

And what are the "luminosities." Are they the same or different than the basis (primordial state is just ChNN's translation of the term gzhi)?

M

florin said:

They are empty luminous expressions of primordial potentiality and understood as such.

Malcolm wrote:

Is there something that isn't? And if not, why isn't looking at a rock just as effective as looking at luminosities?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

If you guys spent half of the time spent doing the things you are saying, you'd all be Mahasiddhas by now!

Malcolm wrote:

Baby steps.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

florin said:

Because by doing a combination of light and dark practices the progress can be much swifter.

Malcolm wrote:

How can there be progress when there is nothing to cultivate?

florin said:

Of course there is no progress because there is no mental cultivation based on effort but there is manifestation of the body of light by stably resting in the primordial state while working with the luminosities.

Malcolm wrote:

And what are the "luminosities." Are they the same or different than the basis (primordial state is just ChNN's translation of the term gzhi)?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Because they are empty.

Astus said:

What isn't?

This is definitely a point of contention. In general, in sūtra, it is considered that on the path of seeing all ordinary appearances vanish, one does not perceive them anymore. It is only in post-equipoise that appearances, albeit, now truly dream-like and illusory, return.

If by "ordinary appearances" it is meant as perceiving with delusion, then it is OK. If what is meant is total cessation of perception, then it is more like nirodha-samapatti.

Malcolm wrote:

When perceiving emptiness on the path of seeing, it is described as perceiving "space like emptiness." One does not perceive characteristics of things at all, therefore, there is no perception of things. It is not nirodha, because there isn't a total cessation of perception. There is a perception of emptiness.

Astus said:

Mañjuśrīmitra states:

That sounds just like the prajnaparamita teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Dzogchen is the state of prajñāpāramita.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

florin said:

Because by doing a combination of light and dark practices the progress can be much swifter.

Malcolm wrote:

How can there be progress when there is nothing to cultivate?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Astus said:

It sounds like you say that people have no experience of their senses, they only think of sense impressions. To me it seems common to just gaze without any thoughts or labels, but still being aware of the view.

Malcolm wrote:

We do not conceptualize when we have a physical sense consciousness. We assemble concepts about what we see through sensation perception and the other mental factors, which produce our second order conceptual consciousness. It is for this reason that "manas" is described as a past mind.

Astus said:

No, the emptiness of emptiness is not a conceptual emptiness, neither is the emptiness of the unconditioned. These things are empty whether we conceptualize that emptiness or not.

Why make them categories of emptiness then?

Malcolm wrote:

Because they are empty.

Astus said:

The direct perception of emptiness is not a "normal" perception. If it were, all people would have it all the time.

Perceiving emptiness is not perceiving a particular object, but the lack of fabrication.

Might call that uncommon, but I was referring to the usual sensory functions, that they do not cease to operate.

Malcolm wrote:

This is definitely a point of contention. In general, in sūtra, it is considered that on the path of seeing all ordinary appearances vanish, one does not perceive them anymore. It is only in post-equipoise that appearances, albeit, now truly dream-like and illusory, return.

Astus said:

The causality that I do not reject is the same as the self that I do not reject.
Fair enough.

Malcolm wrote:

Mañjuśrīmitra states:

It may be said, "The way all this is produced is dependent origination, arising and ceasing."

Like a burnt seed, a nonexistent is not produced from a nonexistent; the cause and the result do not exist.

The mind that clings to entities and clings to cause and result

itself appears as cause and condition, but because those are nondual, there is no arising and perishing.

Because there is no arising and perishing, there is no self and other. Because there is no death and transmigration, there is no permanence and annihilation.

Therefore, there is no delusion or samsara. In fact, there is also no nirvana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...read Longchenpa. And if you don't believe him, let me remind you that according to ChNN, there is no Tibetan who is more authoritative on explaining the meaning of Dzogchen than Longchenpa.

RikudouSennin said:

Any specific text you had in mind?

Malcolm wrote:

To be honest, I am not super pleased with any of the translations of Longchenpa's works that are out there (to be honest, I am not super pleased at the state of translations of Dzogchen material out there in general).

However, that said, you should get a copy of the Treasury of the Dharmadhātu, and the Treasury of Words and Meanings. And you should buy my book, Buddhahood in This Life, when it is released by Wisdom next December.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 7:01 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

florin said:

You see "cultivation" is totally contradicting the immediacy of the principles discussed in KG.

Malcolm wrote:

This is why it is not mentioned much. Kun byed rgyal po is mainly about the basis, the subject that we have not manifested.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 6:29 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

florin said:

You say you've read the commentary. If you did you would know that chapters 70 to 84 deal with meditation and what this means in this context. The tantra of kunjed gyalpo is split in three sections. First section deals with developing prajna through study second with prajna through reflection and third with prajna through meditation.

Malcolm wrote:

I said:

the Kun byed rgyal po does not actually contain instructions about the path of realizing rainbow body. That is what man ngag sde is for, i.e., how to manifest the result which we have not realized (the basis a.k.a "primordial state").

And neither, for that matter, do any of the three surviving lineages of sems sde instruction.

florin said:

I remember other occasions where you maintained that KJ does not contain instructions on meditation, which is of course inaccurate.

Malcolm wrote:

Not in any clear cut and systematic manner. For example, the four samadhis are not systematically explained. The term samadhi is mentioned exactly eight times in the whole text.

And the term sgom, which is mentioned around 32 times means not just meditation, but a whole range of "cultivations", since that really what the term means.

The classic take on sems sde is that it primarily concerns the view. I am pretty happy with that.

If your goal is rainbow body, klong sde and man ngag sde are the ticket. If you want rainbow body, practice according to the sgra thal gyur, the root tantra of Dzogchen in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 5:49 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

florin said:

You say you've read the commentary. If you did you would know that chapters 70 to 84 deal with meditation and what this means in this context. The tantra of kunjed gyalpo is split in three sections. First section deals with developing prajna through study second with prajna through reflection and third with prajna through meditation.

Malcolm wrote:

I said:

the Kun byed rgyal po does not actually contain instructions about the path of realizing rainbow body. That is what man ngag sde is for, i.e., how to manifest the result which we have not realized (the basis a.k.a "primordial state").

And neither, for that matter, do any of the three surviving lineages of sems sde instruction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

florin said:

At this point I think would be in order to suggest that you do 2 things.

First connect with JV and have a serious discussion and second get familiar with Khenpo Shenphen Oser's commentaries on Kunjed Gyalpo.

Malcolm wrote:

I have had many serious discussions with Jim, he is my neighbor (he lives about 10 miles from me). I read Tibetan fluently and I have read the commentary in question, in addition to many, many others. I have also heard ChNN teach on sems sde, many times.

florin said:

However, from what i can see , it appears that you have not discussed with him these very specific points raised here.

Malcolm wrote:

You keep forgetting one thing. Ignorance, ma rig pa.

The reason why the basis is called "the basis" is because we did not realize it because we are under the influence of ignorance.

So while it may be the case from the point of reality that our five elements are actually

the nature of the light of pristine consciousness or "wisdom," we do not see that because, as you yourself put it, we have not manifested that. The practice for manifesting that is the path, and when our body, etc., finally reverts into pristine consciousness, its real nature, this is called the "result."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 5:30 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

These last few attain buddhahood in 500 years after taking birth for 125 years in each of the buddhahelds of the four directions. Dzogchen practitioners have no need to practice Pure land Buddhism.

Tenso said:

You don't think simple recitation is more appropriate for those with a lesser capacity as opposed to doing visualizations?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no distinction between sharp and dull in Dzogchen teachings. The 21 capacities measure diligence in practice, not suitability for receiving Dzogchen teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It means the international liberalization of trade. This has devastating consequences for smaller economies and the environment, and indeed some of the most pernicious effects of neoliberalism the inability of smaller signatory countries to protect their environments in the face of lawsuits from foreign corporations which claim that environmental regulations are trade barriers, etc.

Queequeg said:

Those lawsuits go both ways. Some US environmental standards have been overturned because multinationals brought suit in the international trade court. Those excesses need to be amended.

I don't like the short term drawbacks, but the flipside of liberal trade laws is the economic development it brings and ideally, improvements to standards of living in the long run.

Malcolm wrote:

Globalization has rapidly increased the rate of global warming and habitat loss.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are actually 21 capacities discussed in the Dzogchen tantras, only the best of the best attain rainbow body in this life. The rest are liberated in the bardo, and the last four or so of the average take rebirth in nirmanakāya buddhafiels

Tenso said:

Why shouldn't these last four practice Pure Land exclusively instead? What's the point of Dzogchen for them?

Malcolm wrote:

These last few attain buddhahood in 500 years after taking birth for 125 years in each of the buddhafiels of the four directions. Dzogchen practitioners have no need to practice Pure land Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 5:06 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

florin said:

At this point I think would be in order to suggest that you do 2 things.

First connect with JV and have a serious discussion and second get familiar with Khenpo Shenphen Oser's commentaries on Kunjed Gyalpo.

Malcolm wrote:

I have had many serious discussions with Jim, he is my neighbor (he lives about 10 miles from me). I read Tibetan fluently and I have read the commentary in question, in addition to many, many others. I have also heard ChNN teach on sems sde, many times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Seems that in the end, you approve of neoliberalism.

Queequeg said:

I'm not entirely sure what neoliberalism means. I'll settle for how things are done at a fundamental level with deep reservations, until something better comes along.

Malcolm wrote:

It means the international liberalization of trade. This has devastating consequences for smaller economies and the environment, and indeed some of the most pernicious effects of neoliberalism the inability of smaller signatory countries to protect their environments in the face of lawsuits from foreign corporations which claim that environmental regulations are trade barriers, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

florin said:

You can find such ideas in certain sems de scriptures like kunjed gyalpo. The presentation and introduction of dzogchen view via these ideas, from what I could see up until this point, is very different if not a bit more radical than the views to what most dzogchen practitioners have been introduced to. Unfortunately this particular type of presentation, which happens to be Jim Valby's speciality, has the potential to confuse, disturb and upset lots of practitioners old and new, as well as certain masters.

DGA said:

Thank you. Where in the Kunjed Gyalpo is the realization of ja lus (body of light) discussed?

florin said:

Throughout the entire text. But you will need to be properly introduced to details via oral and symbolic transmission about what it all means to say that we are the body of light already and how it can be manifested.

Malcolm wrote:

That is the point, florin, the Kun byed rgyal po does not actually contain instructions about the path of realizing rainbow body. That is what man ngag sde is for, i.e., how to manifest the result which we have not realized (the basis a.k.a "primordial state").

For example, the commentary on the kun byed rgyal po contains myriad citations from the man ngag sde tantras in order to flesh out the meaning which is not explicitly discussed in the kun byed rgyal po itself. However, when one has received instructions on man ngag sde, then it is relative easy to see how various things stated in the kun byed rgyal po imply thögal.

But there is no way that one can attain the complete result of Dzogchen teachings based on sems sde alone. If you don't believe me, read Longchenpa. And if you don't

believe him, let me remind you that according to ChNN, there is no Tibetan who is more authoritative on explaining the meaning of Dzogchen than Longchenpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 4:27 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, we are happy to support non-ideological dictators, but we are unhappy with ideological dictators like Chavez because they cut into corporate profits.

Queequeg said:

Chavez was an unmitigated idiot. You want to discourage investment in your country? Nationalize everything of value you have.

What he didn't see coming was \$30/barrel oil, and the foundation of that whole plan fell apart.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not take away anything from what I said.

Seems that in the end, you approve of neoliberalism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Rongzom states:

If is asked, "Do characteristics exist or not in appearances?," [...]

tomamundsen said:

Where is this from? Looks like a worthwhile read...

krodha said:

The text is called The Black Snake.

Malcolm wrote:

I meant to answer, it is actually from the Intro to Mahāyāna, but there is also this text mentioned by kyle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So-called "rainbow body" is called properly "a body of light", but I am really not sure that what is described by Orthodox Christians can be considered the same, Ivo, etc., not withstanding. In order to achieve the body of light, you need to have the practice of thogal. Without that, well...

Sherab Dorje said:

Of course there is always the possibility that somebody practiced thogal in a previous life but realised it in this one.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really. And if you have studied the twenty-one capacities of Dzogchen practitioners, you will clearly understand why.

Coming back to this world, other than in a Dharma family, is just not an option.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 2:53 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

An example on this forum - look at the way people look at speech. I don't think you can deny that the Americans have very different ideas about the parameters of permissible speech compared to non-Americans, on the whole.

I don't have the appetite to argue with you about American values... I don't know how much experience you have abroad - that's when you really see how different Americans are.

That has almost zero to do with how America conducts itself globally as an entity, in terms of projecting power, in terms of what it does and does not support in other nations etc. If anything generally our government has a pretty poor track record of supporting these supposed "values", except when they serve financial interests.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, we are happy to support non-ideological dictators, but we are unhappy with ideological dictators like Chavez because they cut into corporate profits.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Queequeg said:

Its even more the case when you try to conduct business abroad. Its shocking to find out how much harder it is to get anything done in other countries after doing business in the US.

Malcolm wrote:

This has mostly to with trust. We have a higher level of trust in business here in the US, but other countries do not have such a high level of trust, and that is why it is harder to get things done in other places. It is really that simple.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The great mistake people make is trying to parse Dzogchen to fit their limited views.

DGA said:

And not only Dzogchen, no? This seems true of every endeavor an afflicted being like myself could get involved with.

Malcolm wrote:

What I mean is this: people hear a facet of Dzogchen teachings, and assume, "Oh, this is the real Dzogchen teaching, the rest are..." This kind of attitude comes from not studying. For example, some people will say, "Dzogchen is the highest yāna, but it must be approached gradually, after practicing ngondro, three roots, etc." Other people will say, "In Dzogchen we do not need to do anything, fix anything, contrive anything, because everything is perfect just as it is."

Both of these statements represent partial views.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We are not conscious of direct perceptions either, since they are nonconceptual. Therefore, according to you, nonconceptual pristine consciousness (nirvikalpajñāna) is an impossibility.

Astus said:

Why wouldn't we be conscious of basic sensory impressions? I think we have a terminology problem here... We see many colours, hear many voices, etc. But of course we do not give special attention to all of that, don't label them all, don't start thinking about them, and so on. However, the store-consciousness is a whole different matter,

and I don't see how your response even relates to that.

Malcolm wrote:

Direct perceptions are nonconceptual by nature. It means we are not conscious of them. We are not conscious of the blueness of the vase when it is perceived by vijñāna, it is only after it has been discriminated and become a second order perception that we become conscious of a blue vase that we have seen.

Astus said:

Again, you here make a wholesale rejection of nonconceptual jñāna, as well as direct perceptions. Thus, for you buddhahood is a conceptual, conditioned, impermanent mind, in contradiction with all the sūtras and tantras.

We can very well understand nonconceptual experiences, actually that's what we normally do all the time, conjecturing about sights and sounds, all sorts meditative experiences, and practically anything. And since sutras and tantras talk about nonconceptuality, they do give explanations and do conceptualise it.

Malcolm wrote:

You are like a man, not content with one shade for the window, who must put up three so that he is in total darkness.

Astus said:

Emptiness is not always the emptiness of something, for example, the emptiness of emptiness or the emptiness of the unconditioned. Awareness is not always an awareness of something, for example, yogic direct perception of emptiness on the path of seeing.

The emptiness of emptiness is dropping the conceptual grasping of the idea of emptiness, so it does have something there. Same goes for the unconditioned. Perception of emptiness is not perceiving anything (i.e. it's only nominally a type of perception), it is just normal perception without the imputation of substance.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the emptiness of emptiness is not a conceptual emptiness, neither is the emptiness of the unconditioned. These things are empty whether we conceptualize that emptiness or not.

The direct perception of emptiness is not a "normal" perception. If it were, all people would have it all the time.

Astus said:

No, you are imputing causality onto appearances, there is no causality which can be found in appearances themselves. If you assert that appearances operate according to causality, you are falling into realism.

What is the kind of causality then that you do not reject?

Malcolm wrote:

The causality that I do not reject is the same as the self that I do not reject.

Astus said:

They act spontaneously.

What does that mean? They act out of habit? Or what is the cause, the intention for their actions?

Malcolm wrote:

A buddha simply responds to the needs of sentient beings spontaneously without any thought at all, in just the same way a wishfulfilling gem grants all wishes without any thought at all about the one who possesses it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, May 4th, 2016 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

DGA said:

Thank you. Where in the Kunjed Gyalpo is the realization of ja lus (body of light) discussed?

Malcolm wrote:

No where.

DGA said:

Thanks Malcolm. That's what I figured but I've not read the text entire, only the translation in The Supreme Source.

Malcolm wrote:

The great mistake people make is trying to parse Dzogchen to fit their limited views.

Dzogchen is a vast body of teachings, and there is no such thing as "pure" Dzogchen. Dzogchen, in its essence, is a part of Secret Mantra and exists with in that context.

Sems sde, within the Dzogchen literature itself, is mainly treated as the completion stage of mahāyoga, and in fact is really more or less the same thing as trekchö.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2016 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

heart said:

So Garab Dorje didn't know how to present Dzogchen in a proper way? The three words are not good enough for you?

/magnus

florin said:

Certain short tantras contained in Kunjed Gyalpo are the exact words of Garab Dorje .So there is no departure from the original meaning.

heart said:

The Dzogchen Tantras are supposedly older than Garab Dorje, so that doesn't compute. But I am sure he quoted from them. However his famous three words don't contain the words; "first, you have to accept that you already have the rainbow body". In fact in Dzogchen texts don't assume an intellectual view at all, either you recognize the natural state or not.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

And the three words themselves are from the sgra thal gyur, originally.

Basically, there is this idea that the five bodhicitta texts translated by Vairocana, the four lungs and Mañjuśrīmitra's Meditation of Bodhicitta, somehow represent the real authentic or original Dzogchen. Well if they do, everybody grab a māla:

Further, because the teacher has declared that awakening can be correctly grasped with a symbol,

in that case, this is the basis of the meditation that generates awakened mind.

After the three samadhis are stable, and after binding three symbolic mudras, generate the mind as the great dharmamudra and meditate the recitation of the essence [mantra].

Because most of us are not realizing the meaning of Dzogchen with the so-called direct method, so indirect methods are called for. Similar encouragements to use tantric methods can be found in the Dorsem Namkhaiche, which are supposedly the first words that Garab Dorje taught.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2016 at 10:35 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Dan74 said:

And is it any better with domestic policies, with people time and again voting against their own best interests due to the ideological brainwashing. Is it any wonder that the average voter is completely confused?

Malcolm wrote:

It has been pointed out that the left in the US votes on its ideals, while the right votes on its resentments.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2016 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

DGA said:

Hm. would you please explain where this ^^^ is taught? I have not heard or read this.

florin said:

You can find such ideas in certain sems de scriptures like kunjed gyalpo. The presentation and introduction of dzogchen view via these ideas, from what i could see up until this point, is very different if not a bit more radical than the views to what most dzogchen practitioners have been introduced to. Unfortunately this particular type of presentation, which happens to be Jim Valby's speciality, has the potential to confuse, disturb and upset lots of practitioners old and new, as well as certain masters.

DGA said:

Thank you. Where in the Kunjed Gyalpo is the realization of ja lus (body of light) discussed?

Malcolm wrote:

No where.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2016 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

florin said:

we are already the body of light. And in order to manifest it all one has to do is to rest in the primordial state.

DGA said:

Hm. would you please explain where this ^^^ is taught? I have not heard or read this.

florin said:

You can find such ideas in certain sems de scriptures like kunjed gyalpo. The presentation and introduction of dzogchen view via these ideas, from what i could see up until this point, is very different if not a bit more radical than the views to what most dzogchen practitioners have been introduced to. Unfortunately this particular type of

presentation, which happens to be Jim Valby's speciality, has the potential to confuse , disturb and upset lots of practitioners old and new, as well as certain masters.

Malcolm wrote:

The bodhicitta texts concern the basis and direct introduction, but they lack any method to attain rainbow body.

It is a given in Dzogchen that our basis or primordial state is essence, nature and compassion. The actual state of the five elements, for example, is the five pristine consciousness, and this is why rainbow body is possible. But we do not manifest rainbow body in the present because of our ignorance, the trio of ignorances which we are subject to after we did not recognize the display of the basis as our own state, once upon a time.

There is not a single idea in the bodhicitta texts such as Kun byed rgyal po and so on that is not present in the man ngag sde. Actually, the reverse is the case. There are many things in man ngag sde which you will never find in the bodhicitta texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2016 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are not only arguing that seeds are not experienced, you argue that the ālayavijñāna does not exist because according to you it is not aware.

Astus said:

The store-consciousness' function is to maintain the seeds, where the seeds and the store-consciousness depend on each other, forming a stream. So, the store-consciousness is aware of the seeds (plus the "material" (not the 5 sense-consciousnesses) world). It includes and maintains all that one is not actually aware of, but it is explained as if there were a consciousness that knows of innumerable things, just like the ordinary ideas about the subconscious and memory where so many things are hidden. However - and this is where the problem is - none of us are actually conscious of anything that the store-consciousness supposedly knows. And, as you have noted before, the eight are simply functions of one consciousness, and it is unreasonable to say that one cannot know what one actually knows, there cannot be such a store-consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

We are not conscious of direct perceptions either, since they are nonconceptual. Therefore, according to you, nonconceptual pristine consciousness (nirvikalpajñāna) is an impossibility.

Astus said:

We did say what was immune [to argument], and that is nonconceptual pristine consciousness.

The reason you say it is immune, is because it cannot be conceived. What cannot be conceived cannot have a meaning, because meaning comes from conceiving what something is. Therefore, it is immune, because it is meaningless. On the other hand, if it is meaningful, then there is something to be conceived, and it is within the boundaries of conceptual analysis, hence not immune.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, you here make a wholesale rejection of nonconceptual jñāna, as well as direct perceptions. Thus, for you buddhahood is a conceptual, conditioned, impermanent mind, in contradiction with all the sūtras and tantras.

Astus said:

It is differentiated because pristine consciousness is the dharmatā of the mind, the essence of the mind.

How can you separate something from its essence? Also, what is not the essence, the attributes? Is it the mind that discerns its own essence?

Malcolm wrote:

In the same way you can separate a grain from its husk. A conceptual mind will never perceive its own essence, because it focuses outward. But when, through either samadhi or introduction, the conceptual stream of the mind is interrupted, the nature of the mind shines out, like the sun shining through clouds, and is unmistakable.

Astus said:

Therefore, the original mind is dharmatā emptiness which is the luminous mind that does not become solely empty by nature or an inert emptiness and is called self-originated wisdom. Since there isn't an iota of a characteristic of conditioned or unconditioned apart from being intrinsically clear emptiness, it is beyond the inert composed of particles, clarity which possesses subject and object, and a knowing consciousness.

Emptiness is always emptiness of something, just as awareness is awareness of something. Saying that appearances are always experienced (awareness, consciousness, mind) and also without essence (empty, not self, ungraspable), is perfectly fine with me. And an empty knowing as an abstract concept is also good, as long as it's not turned into some transcendental soul.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is not always the emptiness of something, for example, the emptiness of emptiness or the emptiness of the unconditioned. Awareness is not always an awareness of something, for example, yogic direct perception of emptiness on the path of seeing.

Astus said:

Who rejected causality? No me. I said it was not something which could be established, that does not mean I negate it.

What would be an establishment, a substrate, for causality? Actually, an ultimate consciousness would be exactly that. However, that's not something I proposed. What I say is that causality is how appearances operate. I can also add to that, just to emphasise the lack of any substrate here, that causality is a conceptual interpretation of appearances, and appearances themselves are very much unattainable. In other words, I take it to be illusory, phenomenal, apparent.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you are imputing causality onto appearances, there is no causality which can be found in appearances themselves. If you assert that appearances operate according to causality, you are falling into realism.

Astus said:

For a completely realized person, there is no difference between a strawberry or a raspberry, so he or she does not need to make a choice.

Does such a person then simply starves to death (or dies from dehydration, or perhaps stops breathing...) because of his inability to function in the world?

Malcolm wrote:

They act spontaneously.

Astus said:

This is of course an experience, it is the realisation that there is no real substance. It could be said that it is the same experience as before, except here there is none of the usual personalisation and objectification.

Malcolm wrote:

And thus, it is an unconditioned experience, a nonconceptual pristine consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2016 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Saoshun said:

Hilary Clinton = War

Malcolm wrote:

On this much, we agree.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2016 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So for you, there can only be conceptual consciousness, and no nonconceptual consciousness, which means there can be no direct perceptions, and awakening is therefore also a conceptual state.

Astus said:

How so? Even the highest jhanas can be experienced, they can occur in the realm of the mind.

Malcolm wrote:

When one is in nirvikalpa samadhi, is this an experience or not? Are there nonconceptual experience? If so, how?

Seeds occurs in the realm of the mind, so why they not experiences?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2016 at 1:22 AM

Title: Is it all America's Fault? Discuss - From POTUS part 2

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

MOD NOTE- THE FOLLOWING WAS SPLIT OFF OF POTUS PART 2.

-QQ

Queequeg said:

In the meantime, I am so grateful there are oceans separating us from the sh*tstorm that is about to hit the old world.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a shitstorm that the West created from colonialist policies. It is actually our mess. We need to help clean it up (and not with more guns and bombs).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2016 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So for you, there can only be conceptual consciousness, and no nonconceptual consciousness, which means there can be no direct perceptions, and awakening is therefore also a conceptual state.

Astus said:

How so? Even the highest jhanas can be experienced, they can occur in the realm of the mind. Seeds do not exist as experiences at all. It's not a question of nonconceptuality.

Malcolm wrote:

You are not only arguing that seeds are not experienced, you argue that the ālayavijñāna does not exist because according to you it is not aware.

Astus said:

It is immune from the conventions of language because nonconceptual pristine cannot be accessed through conceptual analysis, that is the point of Sthiramati's presentation of the Buddha's meaning.

If it's not accessed through conceptual analysis, it is neither a statement, nor an argument, since it cannot be said what is immune.

Malcolm wrote:

We did say what was immune [to argument], and that is nonconceptual pristine consciousness.

Astus said:

Thus, mind is an affliction to be abandoned. Pristine consciousness is a quality to be acquired. Differentiating mind and pristine consciousness, in the end, is all the path is about.

Unfortunately, pristine consciousness is something that cannot be known. It can't be known because it is beyond ordinary mind, and it cannot be known because it is not even in the scope of consciousness. So, how do you differentiate?

Malcolm wrote:

It is differentiated because pristine consciousness is the dharmatā of the mind, the essence of the mind.

Astus said:

That is a pretty pessimistic view, and is at the heart of what Wayfarer was trying to get at with "if there is a an born, etc., there is an unborn, etc."

Why pessimistic? That's the inseparable two truths. It's just that while you like to say rainbow bodies and unconditioned minds, I like a cup of coffee and a slice of <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kal%C3%A1cs>.

Malcolm wrote:

You have not been discussing the inseparable two truths, your two truths are entirely separable.

Astus said:

Sure, no sentient beings, no buddhas. Stands to reason. But there is still something before buddhas attained realization and sentient beings fell into delusion. In Kagyu, it is called the mahāmudra of the basis.

As I have <http://dharma.wheel.net/viewtopic.php?p=336108#p336108>, that basis of samsara and nirvana is the clarity-appearances, in other words, knowing and feeling of all sorts of phenomena.

Malcolm wrote:

Mipham mentions this in the quote I gave you before:

Therefore, the original mind is dharmatā emptiness which is the luminous mind that does not become solely empty by nature or an inert emptiness and is called self-originated wisdom. Since there isn't an iota of a characteristic of conditioned or unconditioned apart from being intrinsically clear emptiness, it is beyond the inert composed of particles, clarity which possesses subject and object, and a knowing consciousness.

Astus said:

Homogeneity means the two truths are inseparable. Since Madhyamakas assert a true relative truth, they do not understand this point. Nondual means that having understood the two truths as inseparable, one abandons views since all phenomena are in fact nondual.

Since they are one, why reject causality and views?

Malcolm wrote:

Who rejected causality? No me. I said it was not something which could be established, that does not mean I negate it.

Astus said:

there is no ability to develop formations— not accepting, not rejecting, not moving, and not seeking. As such, this culmination of the comprehension of being like an illusion is also proven to be the culmination of comprehending the two truths as inseparable. So, if such a person is offered a choice between strawberry and raspberry, can he not decide? If he can, how is that not accepting and rejecting?

Malcolm wrote:

For a completely realized person, there is no difference between a strawberry or a raspberry, so he or she does not need to make a choice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2016 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

florin said:

First , i have no such leanings and never had .

Second, your consideration by implication accuses Jim Valby of perennial sympathies

since this somewhat controversial assertion comes from him.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, well, if this assertion comes from Jim, I don't agree with Jim.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, May 3rd, 2016 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

florin said:

It happens or it happened in the Orthodox tradition but since this church is in minority compared to the rest of western traditions it is not very well known .I could be mistaken but many years ago i vaguely remember reading a story of a particular hermit which lived most of his adult life alone in the forest and which at the end of his life did not die but transmuted his phisycal body into the body of light.

Malcolm wrote:

So-called "rainbow body" is called properly "a body of light", but I am really not sure that what is described by Orthodox Christians can be considered the same, lvo, etc., not withstanding. In order to achieve the body of light, you need to have the practice of thogal. Without that, well...

florin said:

Apparently there is no need to practice thogal in order to manifest the body of light.

Malcolm wrote:

If you wish to believe this is so, I am not going to stop you. I generally consider such impulses to come out of the Perennial Philosophy movement.

florin said:

Of course in the history of dzogchen practice most evidence if not all points to the contrary , including longde. But the assertion that all practitioners who manifested the body of light practiced thogal does not mean, in my opinion , that the body of light can ONLY be manifested if one practices thogal ,longde or dark vissionary practices.

Malcolm wrote:

You are free to believe what you will.

For myself, I don't see how it possible, barring certain kinds of completion stage practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2016 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Karma is only function of a delusion; the eight consciousness are just a name for different functions of one consciousness, that consciousness is deluded.

Astus said:

It cannot be a function of consciousness if there is no consciousness/awareness of it.

Malcolm wrote:

So for you, there can only be conceptual consciousness, and no nonconceptual consciousness, which means there can be no direct perceptions, and awakening is therefore also a conceptual state.

Astus said:

It is free from extremes since none of these terms are relevant to the meaning. It can't be refuted because it not a subject of analysis by ordinary persons.

What is relevant to the meaning then? It is still a statement made within the boundaries of conventional language, so it cannot be exempt from the rules of argument.

Malcolm wrote:

It is immune from the conventions of language because nonconceptual pristine cannot be accessed through conceptual analysis, that is the point of Sthiramati's presentation of the Buddha's meaning.

Astus said:

Right, the mind does not need to purified. It is an affliction to be abandoned.

Where are the afflictions, if not within the realm of consciousness?

Malcolm wrote:

Thus, mind is an affliction to be abandoned. Pristine consciousness is a quality to be acquired. Differentiating mind and pristine consciousness, in the end, is all the path is about.

Astus said:

Nope. Pratyatmyavedana, "personally known for oneself."

That's a strange Sanskrit word.

Malcolm wrote:

It is actually quite common in Sanskrit Buddhist texts.

Astus said:

Drinking tea and getting dressed are activities of delusion.

Delusions are all there is.

Malcolm wrote:

That is a pretty pessimistic view, and is at the heart of what Wayfarer was trying to get at with "if there is a an born, etc., there is an unborn, etc."

Astus said:

"Conditioned generation is the place of enlightenment, because ignorance and so forth through old age and death, are all unexhausted. The afflictions are bodhi, because of understanding according to actuality. Sentient beings are the place of enlightenment, because of understanding no-self. All dharmas are the place of enlightenment, because of understanding the emptiness of the dharmas."

(Vimalakirti Sutra, ch 4, BDK Edition, p 100)

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, no sentient beings, no buddhas. Stands to reason. But there is still something before buddhas attained realization and sentient beings fell into delusion. In Kagyu, it is called the mahāmudra of the basis.

Astus said:

Madhyamakas cling to correct relative truth, not understanding homogeneity and nonduality.

What do you mean by homogeneity and nonduality?

Malcolm wrote:

Homogeneity means the two truths are inseparable. Since Madhyamakas assert a true relative truth, they do not understand this point. Nondual means that having understood the two truths as inseparable, one abandons views since all phenomena are in fact nondual.

Astus said:

Everything is completely equivalent to an illusion, not merely "like" an illusion.

I think there are two possible reasons that rarely anyone puts up an extreme claim as you seem to do. Antinomianism is feared to be misused as

<http://www.georgegatenby.id.au/kw40.htm>, or one wants a more coherent system that includes the stages of the path. Probably the two goes together.

Illusions are causes and conditions. It makes little difference to call pain and joy illusory as long as one is bound by them. And when not bound, it doesn't matter whether one calls them illusory or not either.

Malcolm wrote:

Astus, the etymology of the word "Illusion" is maya, maya means "deception" and "false." Appearances are either false or not. They cannot be a little false, just as one cannot be a little pregnant.

Rongzom states:

If is asked, "Do characteristics exist or not in appearances?," if characteristics are held to exist, how will the system of the Great Perfection be the culmination of comprehending "like an illusion?" In that case, the higher and lower views are merely differentiate between more and less attachment to reality in appearances.

For example, for the reflection of a black snake in the water; some will see a snake, [48/a] and will leave due to their fear. Likewise, even though phenomena which are a source of suffering are like an illusion, they are abandoned by the hearers who perceive them as real.

Even though some understand the black snake to be a reflection, thinking it will be harmful if touched, even so they depend on medicine. Likewise, even though in the system of the perfection of wisdom the relative is like an illusion. However since there is a view in which functional agents exist, one develops pristine consciousness concerning the objects of knowledge and relies upon the medicine of great compassion. [This is the perspective from which you are making your arguments, Astus]

Since some understand the black snake is a reflection. Even though it touched, no harm is perceived. They able to communicate to those with anxiety that its touch has no power. Likewise, in the systems of action and outer yoga tantra, even though it is comprehended there is no fault in lower conduct and substances, they do not have the capacity for intrepid behavior. But they have the capacity for the behavior of making offerings to deities, perform strict discipline, accomplishment substances, etc.

Some understand there is no fault in touching a black snake even if touching it has the ability to harm, because that anxiety is rapidly removed, for which reason the strict discipline of the conduct of subjugation exists.[49/a] Likewise, the system of inner yoga stands on the neck of practice to quickly render all phenomena homogenous. One's behavior specifically corresponds to the strict discipline of the absence of virtue and misdeed in phenomena and the lack of no purity or impurity in food choices.

Since some, possessing an undeceived mind regarding the characteristic of a reflection of a black snake, see all of those behaviors as the behavior of children. Thus, leaving aside the others, abandoning existents, etc.;, even the heroic subjugation of that reflection of a black snake is seen as a childish thought. Accepting, rejecting or a mind fabricating the condition of those cannot develop, and moving and seeking do not occur. Likewise, since the system of the Great Perfection comprehends and is the culmination of the comprehension of all phenomena as totally equivalent to illusions, in that case, the mind is not confused by the power of appearances and there is no ability to develop formations— not accepting, not rejecting, not moving, and not seeking. As such, this culmination of the comprehension of being like an illusion is also proven to be the culmination of comprehending the two truths as inseparable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2016 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

fckw said:

Well, to be fair, there IS a reason why I practice Buddhist meditation and not, for example, Christian contemplative prayer.

Virgo said:

Do Christians attain Rainbow Body?

Kevin

florin said:

It happens or it happened in the Orthodox tradition but since this church is in minority compared to the rest of western traditions it is not very well known .I could be mistaken but many years ago i vaguely remember reading a story of a particular hermit which lived most of his adult life alone in the forest and which at the end of his life did not die but transmuted his phisycal body into the body of light.

Malcolm wrote:

So-called "rainbow body" is called properly "a body of light", but I am really not sure that what is described by Orthodox Christians can be considered the same, lvo, etc., not withstanding. In order to achieve the body of light, you need to have the practice of thogal. Without that, well...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2016 at 11:05 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

From the ecological point of view, human beings are the most pernicious invasive species of all time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2016 at 5:59 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorpion (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In the Tibetan, it is clearly translated as "unconditioned" (' dus ma byas, asaṃskṛita), not "cessation" (nirodha, dgog pa). You are using Mueller's list, not the text itself.

Astus said:

Muller simply translated it: http://tripitaka.cbeta.org/T31n1614_001, and it lists the same 6 unconditioned dharmas, 1 empty space (虛空), 1 suchness (真如), and 4 types of cessation (滅). <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kuiji>

http://tripitaka.cbeta.org/T44n1836_002 lists the same six. See also the

<http://www.cttbusa.org/100shastra/100dharmas9.asp>.

Malcolm wrote:

I think I will stick with the Tibetan translation.

Astus said:

There are no moments, so this is not a problem. The three times are not established. If that's not a problem, then there is no need for any seeds to connect past actions with future fruits, thus the storehouse-consciousness is redundant.

Malcolm wrote:

Karma is only function of a delusion; the eight consciousness are just a name for different functions of one consciousness, that consciousness is deluded.

Astus said:

It is an argument — nonconceptual pristine consciousness is immune to refutation because it is free from all extremes.

It is nonconceptual, and not conceptual. That's an extreme. It is pristine, not defiled. That's an extreme. It is an independent consciousness, not a dependent one. That's an extreme. Since it's not at all free from extremes, it is not immune to refutation either.

Malcolm wrote:

It is free from extremes since none of these terms are relevant to the meaning. It can't be refuted because it not a subject of analysis by ordinary persons.

The point is that delusion is not part of the mind.

Is it outside the mind then? Because then the mind need not be purified.

Right, the mind does not need to be purified. It is an affliction to be abandoned.

One says "self-originated" because reality is only discerned for oneself without depending on another.

So is it another term for mind made?

Nope. Pratyatmyavedana, "personally known for oneself."

Sure there is emptiness outside of the aggregates, the emptiness of emptiness, for example, or the emptiness of the unconditioned. The dharmadhātu is an emptiness "outside of the aggregates."

Seeing the emptiness of the aggregates is about clarifying whatever we experience.

Otherwise, the various categories of emptiness are for refuting specific attachments to specific ideas, so theoretically we could have as many types of emptiness as concepts.

You said there was no emptiness outside of the aggregates.

Who is denying appearances? Appearances self-display, but no cause and condition can be found for them. Who denies conventionality? The conventional is just deluded attributions for self-displayed appearances.

Is self-display like self-originated, i.e. mind made? If, as you seem to say, the correct view is when appearances only self-display without causality and interdependence, then how can one drink tea that way, or even get dressed?

Drinking tea and getting dressed are activities of delusion.
But this not a confirmation of conventionality.
It seems so to me.
It seems so to those who cling to the conventional as real. Madhyamakas cling to correct relative truth, not understanding homogeneity and nonduality.

Everything is completely equivalent to an illusion, not merely "like" an illusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2016 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Why vote for another incompetent politician who lost billions for his investors in four bankruptcies?

Tenso said:

What's the alternative? You tell me.

Malcolm wrote:

It sure isn't Trump. He has no interest in this apart from satisfying his ego.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2016 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We, along with Europe, caused the Syrian crisis, etc.

Tenso said:

Yeah by incompetent leaders to be exact. But why should should ordinary citizens be made to suffer now due to those careless mistakes?

Malcolm wrote:

Why vote for another incompetent politician who lost billions for his investors in four bankruptcies?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2016 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Tenso said:

Do you actually know the severity of their situation right now? Their women are afraid to leave their own homes in fear of being sexually assaulted and raped. Should Germans that are horrified by that all be condemned as "racists" in your opinion?

Malcolm wrote:

I know that in the fringe media, there is a lot of hysteria. I have relatives in Germany. I assure you, it is not a scene out of Road Warrior.

Tenso said:

Your statements about Trump is typical slander from the far left.

Malcolm wrote:

My statement is based on Trump's own words. If you find his comments about Mexicans, Muslims, women, torture and so on acceptable, I pity you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2016 at 1:59 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Manjushri Fan said:

I would say the article is true, for the UK.

I don't see anything wrong with immigration, only the far right see immigration as detrimental to their quality of life and culture

Tenso said:

Nothing wrong with immigration at all for those that are able to assimilate.

Malcolm wrote:

We, along with Europe, caused the Syrian crisis, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2016 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Ayu said:

It's fine - as long as your mind is not stirred with hate, tension and anxieties.

Tenso said:

Strongly admire your composure. If I was a native German I'd be completely horrified right now.

Malcolm wrote:

I am sure many racist Germans are horrified right now.

Face it, Trump's campaign is nationalist, and all nationalist campaigns are fundamentally racist and xenophobic.

I don't really see how any Dharma practitioner can support Trump because of his race-baiting, war-mongering jingoism and xenophobic policies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2016 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is the error of your view. You imagine that conventional things are like hollow bubbles, they have no insides, but they still somehow exist.

Astus said:

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn22/sn22.095.than.html>, and

All conditioned phenomena

Are like a dream, an illusion, a bubble, a shadow

Like the dew, or like lightning

You should discern them like this

(http://www.acmuller.net/bud-canon/diamond_sutra.html, ch 32)

In reality, also the hollow bubbles you cling to have never arisen, so what is the need to even speak of their essence?

Sure, all dharmas are unborn, inconceivable, and inexpressible. At the same time, there is no emptiness outside the aggregates, or to talk of anything else but the insubstantiality of one's experiences.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure there is emptiness outside of the aggregates, the emptiness of emptiness, for example, or the emptiness of the unconditioned. The dharmadhātu is an emptiness "outside of the aggregates.

Astus said:

Denying appearances, denying conventionality - what is that good for?

Malcolm wrote:

Who is denying appearances? Appearances self-display, but no cause and condition can be found for them. Who denies conventionality? The conventional is just deluded attributions for self-displayed appearances.

Astus said:

As the quote goes (MMK 24.14): "All is possible when emptiness is possible. Nothing is

possible when emptiness is impossible."

Malcolm wrote:

But this not a confirmation of conventionality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2016 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, delusion exists as an adulteration of the mind, but since it is not inherent to the mind, it is extraneous to the mind from the beginning.

Astus said:

Delusion is the delusion of the mind, not something outside it. As for its inherency, I did not say anything like that.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that delusion is not part of the mind.

Astus said:

This not only a dhyānic radiance.

It is not, "In the later developed concept...", as the essay says. And so it's been further developed in Theravada, just like in Mahayana. But it has not been said so in the suttas themselves.

Malcolm wrote:

Do you take the suttas to be the definitive statement on the Buddha's teachings?

Astus said:

Everything which appears is merely a conditioned self-apparent display nondual with an unconditioned self-originated pristine consciousness.

That's certainly one way to say it. However, if we analysed that sentence, it would be quite problematic. For instance, just as you say that arising of even one thing is not established, self-origination is refuted in the same way.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

One says "self-originated" because reality is only discerned for oneself without depending on another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2016 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Same text, Tibetan translation from Chinese.

Astus said:

I don't see any feeling and perception among the unconditioned dharma on that list. Unless you mean saṃjñā-vedayita-nirodha, what is a cessation.

Malcolm wrote:

In the Tibetan, it is clearly translated as "unconditioned" ('dus ma byas, asaṃskṛita), not "cessation" (nirodha, dgog pa). You are using Mueller's list, not the text itself.

Astus said:

If nothing substantiates nominal interdependence, why argue so hard that consciousness must be conditioned?

There is just nominal interdependence, that is, conditioned phenomena. Saying that there is an unconditioned consciousness leans towards permanence, and saying there is no consciousness leans towards nothingness. So, I prefer the language of dependence-impermanence.

Malcolm wrote:

Not if it is understood as empty, which indeed it is. All phenomena are empty, whether, conditioned or unconditioned.

Astus said:

It is not a hidden consciousness.

Who experiences it? Ordinary people don't see it, and buddhas don't even have it. Plus there is a problem that it requires innumerable moments of consciousness in a single moment, in order to maintain the flow of unripe past impressions.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no moments, so this is not a problem. The three times are not established.

Astus said:

It is a very good argument, one that has left you silenced and unable to reply.

I have replied that it's not an argument. You just turned that into a personal remark now, instead of showing how it was a valid statement from your part.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

It is an argument — nonconceptual pristine consciousness is immune to refutation because it is free from all extremes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, May 2nd, 2016 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Astus said:

Annihilation is the error when something is eliminated or something ceases to exist. There has never been an essence ever, so it cannot be nullified. So, where does it apply to what I say?

Malcolm wrote:

This is the error of your view. You imagine that conventional things are like hollow bubbles, they have no insides, but they still somehow exist.

In reality, also the hollow bubbles you cling to have never arisen, so what is the need to even speak of their essence?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2016 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Astus said:

However, assuming a duality between buddha-nature and the defilements is exactly the theory of atman.

Malcolm wrote:

No, no more for example, that assuming that a husk is not the germ is a theory of atman.

Astus said:

Delusion exists as an element of the mind-stream, and when delusion is removed, it's not a factor in the mind any more. It is like the clearing of water, that is not coloured by defilements

Malcolm wrote:

No, delusion exists as an adulteration of the mind, but since it is not inherent to the mind, it is extraneous to the mind from the beginning.

Astus said:

It's jhana radiance, not soul radiance.

"In early Buddhism, the "radiant mind" (pabhassara citta) refers neither to an absolutely pure state of mind nor to spiritual liberation, but is the dhyanic mind that is radiant on account of not being disturbed or influenced by external stimuli."

(<http://dharmafarer.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/8.3-Radiant-mind.-piya.pdf>)

Malcolm wrote:

Not so fast, Kimosabe, your pdf ends by saying:

The Buddhist teaching that the mind is by nature radiant is a very wholesome notion in working with suffering. It means that suffering is mind-made situation, a misperception of true reality, that clouds out the natural radiance, plunging one into greater darkness of delusion and pain. When the mind is attended to directly with mindfulness, one touches the natural radiance, and when one clears away the mental hindrances and other defilements, the mind shine radiantly again.

This not only a dhyānic radiance.

Astus said:

"Consciousness without feature, without end, luminous all around: Here water, earth, fire, & wind have no footing. Here long & short coarse & fine fair & foul name & form are all brought to an end. With the cessation of [the activity of] consciousness each is here brought to an end."

As the sutta itself says, consciousness ceases. Adding in brackets "activity of" means little, since a non-active consciousness is just unconsciousness. See more:

<https://sujato.wordpress.com/2011/05/13/vinna%E1%B9%87a-is-not-nibbana-really-it-just-isn%E2%80%99t/>. More analysis on the unestablished consciousness:

<http://dharmafarer.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/17.8a-Khandha-5-Vinnana-piya.pdf>.

Malcolm wrote:

So you are an advocate of cessation. When a buddha or arhat dies, his consciousness ceases. This is definitely not the Mahāyāna view.

Astus said:

It is no different from Madhyamaka's middle way of empty interdependence.

Malcolm wrote:

In order for one thing to depend on another thing, one thing must arise upon which another must depend. But this does not solve anything. Why? Since the arising of even one thing cannot be established, there is no arising. Everything which appears is merely a conditioned self-apparent display nondual with an unconditioned self-originated pristine consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2016 at 9:43 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Um, Astus, one is called vedana-asamkṛita, the other is called samjñā asamkṛita, respectively unconditioned sensation and unconditioned perception/ideation.

Astus said:

I used this one from Vasubandhu:

<http://www.acmuller.net/yogacara/outlines/100dharma.html>. What is your source?

Malcolm wrote:

Same text, Tibetan translation from Chinese.

Astus said:

If you claim it is merely an essence of phenomena that have not arisen, this means you grasp to the conventional as real. This comes from not understanding homogeneity and nonduality.

Being real requires an essence. Without essence, what is there to be called real?

Conventionality is nominal interdependence, appearing illusion without anything substantiating it. To say that there is nothing that arises is a conventional expression that sounds like utter nothingness. I'm not saying that the dharmas are not unborn.

What I'm saying is that there are other ways to put things.

Malcolm wrote:

If nothing substantiates nominal interdependence, why argue so hard that consciousness must be conditioned?

Astus said:

That is really not true at all. For example, what takes rebirth in the yogacara system is precisely the ālayavijñāna.

That's how they came up with an explanation for karma, positing a hidden consciousness to bridge death and birth, cause and effect, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a hidden consciousness.

Astus said:

When we see the conventional as the conventional, then we can understand that things like causes and conditions are just erroneous attributions. Since this is the case, conditioned consciousnesses are impossible. Why? Because when the conventional is seen as conventional, it is seen as a delusion.

And that's all we have, the illusory world. An opposite of that would be a real world, or nothingness. Here you just deny it, so that's the nothingness option.

Malcolm wrote:

No, there is no denial, even an illusory world is not established. Why deny what has never been established from the start?

Astus said:

Further, the Kāśyapa-parivarta Sūtra states: ...

Sthiramati's comment on how this is understood is instructive: ...

That is equal to saying: not this, not that, but I cannot say what. That is not an argument, or even a statement.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a very good argument, one that has left you silenced and unable to reply.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2016 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Bristollad said:

That's an excellent illustration that whites can't dance. What, are they paralyzed from the hip up?

Nope, that just the style

and Malcom, No man, those people are Irish, not "White", which is a special "ethnic" term some pink-skinned people in the US use to refer to themselves.

So how would you define pink-skinned ethnic group in the USA that calls itself "white"?

Who is in it? Non-dancers, who else?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2016 at 3:10 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Your assertion that all consciousnesses are conditioned is unproven. For example, Vasubandhu notes that there are unconditioned sensations and perceptions among the six unconditioned dharmas he identifies.

Astus said:

So, the 6 unconditioned dharmas are: space, 4 types of cessation, suchness. None of them are anything in particular. Calling them "consciousness" doesn't really fit, since they do not denote any thought, feeling, or perception.

Malcolm wrote:

Um, Astus, one is called vedana-asamkṛita, the other is called samjñā asamkṛita, respectively unconditioned sensation and unconditioned perception/ideation.

Astus said:

Not only that, but the Bodhisattvapitika clearly states: Further, an unconditioned consciousness is a pristine consciousness (jñāna)

That refers to the absence of self-grasping. But what functions as consciousness is

dependently arisen.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not the intent of the sutra. Why? Because it contrasts conditioned with unconditioned consciousness.

Astus said:

Consciousness in which there is no delusion is a pristine consciousness, self-originated and unconditioned.

See my previous comment. Although it can be said that since there is no attachment, it doesn't rely on anything, doesn't identify with anything, so in a way it is as you say. My problem is that when it is said there is an "unconditioned consciousness", because consciousness means knowing and thinking, and there can be no knowing and thinking without causes and conditions, it is a contradiction.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a contradiction only if one has stubborn clinging things as real. But we already know that causes and conditions are completely unreal, so why get stuck on a consciousness being unconditioned? In reality, there are no conditioned phenomena because cause and conditions are not established, having never arisen from the beginning. If you claim it is merely an essence of phenomena that have not arisen, this means you grasp to the conventional as real. This comes from not understanding homogeneity and nonduality.

Astus said:

So what isn't a theory?

That's a valid question. The difference here is that while normally it is easy to identify the first six consciousnesses, and that's what one works with, the 7th and 8th are not seen nor used for anything, except for theorising about karma.

Malcolm wrote:

That is really not true at all. For example, what takes rebirth in the yogacara system is precisely the ālayavijñāna.

Astus said:

No, the basis of the "conventional" is delusion. Cause and condition cannot be established apart from delusion, they are rooted in delusion, and therefore, the basis of the conventional is also delusion.

The delusion in conventional is to take it for the absolute. When conventional is seen as conventional, there is no problem, so it is then the absolute. In other words, conventional is not negated but enlightened. But, again, we can say that there is either deluded functions and buddha functions, and the two never meet. However, I consider that model more misleading.

Malcolm wrote:

When we see the conventional as the conventional, then we can understand that things like causes and conditions are just erroneous attributions. Since this is the case, conditioned consciousnesses are impossible. Why? Because when the conventional is

seen as conventional, it is seen as a delusion.

Further, the Kāśyapa-parivarta Sūtra states:

"Permanent," that is one extreme;"impermanent," that is another extreme. Whatever is the middle of those two cannot be investigated.

Sthiramati's comment on how this is understood is instructive:

If it is asked what is an extreme, the extreme of the tirthikas is grasping at a self. That is grasped as permanent, reifying the aggregates, sense bases and elements..."Permanent,' that is the first extreme..." means "self, that is the first extreme."

The śravakas and pratyekabuddhas grasp the aggregates and so on as impermanent and grasp them as selfless..."Impermanent,' that is the second extreme..." means "selfless, that is the second extreme."

"Whatever is the middle of those two, that is..." means that is nonconceptual pristine consciousness. Because that cannot be analyzed, it cannot be investigated.

Something [nonconceptual pristine consciousness] which is neither permanent nor impermanent can hardly be called conditioned. It also cannot be called something that arises from cause and conditions. Nonconceptual pristine consciousness is by definition beyond the range of conventional analysis and can only be discovered for oneself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, May 1st, 2016 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Please be more consistent with the enforcement of the rules

Content:

boda said:

I left and started the moribund Vajracakra because I was being targeted by a pathological maniac
Karma's a bitch.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 8:14 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Bristollad said:

<https://youtu.be/B718RsboGEI>

"Whites" can't dance? Of course, white is not an ethnic group.

Malcolm wrote:

No man, those people are Irish, not "White", which is a special "ethnic" term some pink-skinned people in the US use to refer to themselves.

```
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: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 8:00 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The seer is empty clarity.

Astus said:

Is clarity a form of consciousness/awareness/knowing? If yes, it is conditioned. If no, what is it?

Malcolm wrote:

Your assertion that all consciousnesses are conditioned is unproven. For example, Vasubandhu notes that there are unconditioned sensations and perceptions among the six unconditioned dharmas he identifies. Not only that, but the Bodhisattvapitika clearly states:

Futher, an unconditioned consciousness is a pristine consciousness (jñāna)

Astus said:

If the eight consciousnesses are the assumption of self in consciousness, when there is no such mistake, it is impure. Is that what you say?

Malcolm wrote:

Consciousness in which there is no delusion is a pristine consciousness, self-originated and unconditioned.

Astus said:

I have been saying that for a while.

Malcolm wrote:

So what isn't a theory?

Astus said:

Causality is the basis of the conventional, the illusory. I don't say it is anything more than conceptual.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the basis of the "conventional" is delusion. Cause and condition cannot be established apart from delusion, they are rooted in delusion, and therefore, the basis of the conventional is also delusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 7:25 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When the three realms are seen as delusion from top to bottom, then it is seen correctly.

Astus said:

And the question is if you propose that the seer is real or illusory.

Malcolm wrote:

The seer is empty clarity.

Astus said:

Pristine consciousness is not a product of causes and conditions since no causes and conditions can be found at all. If you insist that the only thing that exists are things produced out of causes and conditions, your view is really no better than realism, and betrays an inner attachment to a self of persons and things.

Pristine consciousness is the same consciousness as the deluded one, with the difference that it lacks identification. And then it can be said that the absence of identification is unconditioned.

Malcolm wrote:

Pristine consciousness is not the same consciousness as the deluded consciousness, but you can say that the eight consciousnesses arise from mistaking the nature of self-originated pristine consciousness for being a self.

Astus said:

What I am saying here is that what one experiences is the seeds in the sense that without the seeds/traces there are no deluded experiences to be had.

Yes, the seeds are the assumed causes of delusion. And because it is merely an assumption, it's nothing experienced, but an element of a theoretical explanation.

Malcolm wrote:

So what, now you are saying that the all-basis consciousness is merely a theory?

I also note that you did not reply to my charge that you are suffering from an hidden grasping to the self of persons and things by your insistence on the verity of cause and

condition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 7:11 PM

Title: Re: Please be more consistent with the enforcement of the rules

Content:

Dan74 said:

MYM and Malcolm, you may well have a point but do you remember a few years ago when moderation was a lot more lax, a number of people left in a huff because they felt they were being harassed by certain members and blamed the mods for not stepping in?

Malcolm wrote:

I did not leave in a huff. I left and started the moribund Vajracakra because I was being targeted by a pathological maniac and the moderation team would not do anything about it at all, despite repeated complaints, while concerning themselves with "proper language" and so on. I did not find the team then more lax, I found them concerned with the wrong issues. Focusing on trivia like "bad words," when it was clear that one of its (most valuable) users was being totally harassed.

Dan74 said:

More recently a number of people complained in public and private that the level of discord on the forum is really unpleasant and left.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this happens. People lose their appetite for aggressive posters.

Dan74 said:

Lightening up and having a light touch are always a good thing but balancing conflicting preferences of members for a more hands-off approach vs tighter more civil tone, is quite tricky.

Malcolm wrote:

I would focus more on whether people are being kind to each other, than on whether they are using swear words.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 6:57 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Causality is a delusion. Further, your assertion proposes that there cannot be a consciousness of any kind which is free of the three realms, which does not take birth in the three realms, that outside of the three realms there can be no sort of consciousness at all.

Astus said:

If the three realms stand for a deluded approach, one should leave all that behind; but as long as there is something one takes as the true self, an ultimate consciousness, it is still the three realms of delusion. If the three realms can be viewed with either a pure or an impure mind, then there is no other realm or consciousness to look for either, thus we are already in the pure land of Shakyamuni.

Malcolm wrote:

The three realms are by definition a place of suffering and samsara. Merely looking at it through rose-colored glasses won't change anything but the color.

The terms "ultimate" and "relative" are much abused. To be ultimate is merely to be seen correctly, to be relative is merely to be seen incorrectly. When the three realms are seen as delusion from top to bottom, then it is seen correctly.

Astus said:

Au contraire, this is why we have rainbow body.

This body-mind is no different from a rainbow - it looks like there is something, but it's just the momentary product of causes and conditions.

Malcolm wrote:

Pristine consciousness is not a product of causes and conditions since no causes and conditions can be found at all. If you insist that the only thing that exists are things produced out of causes and conditions, your view is really no better than realism, and betrays an inner attachment to a self of persons and things.

Astus said:

The problem is with deluded appearances. The appearances of pristine consciousness are not a problem, and nor can there be any attachment to them. If there is attachment, the appearance is automatically a product of delusion and is delusion.

Then this is only a matter of terminology.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really.

Astus said:

All eight consciousnesses and their attendant dharmas are delusion, products of delusion and experiences of delusion.

The question is about experiencing seeds, not delusions. Since seeds are not experienced, they are conceptual assumptions of a theoretical explanation, a philosophical attempt to connect action and fruit.

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't say that the seeds were experienced, you really did not understand the sentence.

I said:

All delusion is the experience of seeds/traces.

What I am saying here is that what one experiences is the seeds in the sense that without the seeds/traces there are no deluded experiences to be had.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 5:43 PM

Title: Re: ye shes and jalus

Content:

Tenso said:

how are these two the same and different from one another?

thanks

Malcolm wrote:

Rainbow body is formed out of pristine consciousness, or to put it more accurately, when the elements of the body revert to their original nature as pristine consciousness, this is called "rainbow body."

It does not mean that you suddenly burst into rainbow light, if you attain this in this life, ordinary people will still see you just as you were, but perhaps you will not cast a shadow.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 5:33 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Queequeg said:

People waiving Mexican flags protesting scared white people having a rally is just going to tend to galvanize those scared white people.

Myoho-Nameless said:

White people have very, very few places to turn or things to identify with when they feel, and also ARE, antagonized. What do we have?

I predict a massive swing to the right in the coming decades. Nothing like the Trump bandwagon. Non whites antagonize whites at their own risk. Population issues are nothing, "useless breeders" can easily be adversely affected by a wealthy power minority.

Johnny Dangerous said:

You mean *poor* white people, who are most of Trump's base, and will be the base for similar movements to come. The irony is, they will be lead by people like Trump that

don't give two squats about the plight of poor whites, or anyone else, but simply find turning poor people of different races against one another to be politically useful to maintain their oligarchy. Truthfully, it does happen to some degree on the democratic side too, for sure.

Malcolm wrote:

"Whites" should get over themselves. They do not even form a coherent ethnic community, unless you define them by the fact that white people in general cannot dance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 5:32 PM

Title: Re: Please be more consistent with the enforcement of the rules

Content:

mindyourmind said:

I really believe that the moderators here can lighten up a bit, and that goes for language, for topics and for tough debates. The Dharma, and its practitioners, can handle more than what you seem to think. Open the windows, let the fresh air and sunlight stream in.

Some of the rules here would please a Baptist preacher.

(I say this with great love for the mods and the forum, but above all for the Dharma)

Ayu said:

Can you please write a PM to the respective moderators about what you mean exactly? Which cases? Which acts of moderation? This critique is not helpful, because there is not the slightest hint, what you are talking about.

Malcolm wrote:

He means that the moderation here is often a bit overbearing. The moderation team here has heard this complaint before and usually responds with "You have no idea how tolerant we are" followed with "You have no idea how hard it is to be a moderator."

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 5:20 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Even so, this does not go beyond delusion.

Astus said:

Anything that is beyond causality is irrelevant in life.

Malcolm wrote:

Causality is a delusion. Further, your assertion proposes that there cannot be a consciousness of any kind which is free of the three realms, which does not take birth in the three realms, that outside of the three realms there can be no sort of consciousness at all.

Astus said:

No, it isn't.

In that case, there is neither enlightenment in this life, nor is it compatible with life.

Malcolm wrote:

Au contraire, this is why we have rainbow body.

Astus said:

This is a subtle reification of things. Your view here is very much the same as the Gelugpa view.

Do you think then that the problem is not (only) with attachment, but with appearances?

Malcolm wrote:

The problem is with deluded appearances. The appearances of pristine consciousness are not a problem, and nor can there be any attachment to them. If there is attachment, the appearance is automatically a product of delusion and is delusion.

Astus said:

All delusion is the experience of seeds/traces.

Deluded experiences are manifestations of seeds, not the seeds themselves.

Malcolm wrote:

All eight consciousnesses and their attendant dharmas are delusion, products of delusion and experiences of delusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 3:21 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Queequeg said:

People waiving Mexican flags protesting scared white people having a rally is just going to tend to galvanize those scared white people.

Myoho-Nameless said:

White people have very, very few places to turn or things to identify with when they feel, and also ARE, antagonized. What do we have?

I predict a massive swing to the right in the coming decades. Nothing like the Trump bandwagon. Non whites antagonize whites at their own risk. Population issues are nothing, "useless breeders" can easily be adversely affected by a wealthy power minority.

Malcolm wrote:

Fascism is easy, but it always ends badly for the Fascists...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is suffering they brought on themselves, no pity.

Queequeg said:

Indeed.

```
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]
```

Malcolm wrote:

Hahaha. White trash indeed. What a putz.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Enlightenment of Robots?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The former.

Queequeg said:

What would be the merit quotient of setting loose a bot that just spammed mantras across the internet?

Malcolm wrote:

Not much. At least you have to turn a prayer wheel, and it requires some attention.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Poor scared white people...boo hoo.

Queequeg said:

where's your compassion? look at how they suffer.

Malcolm wrote:

It is suffering they brought on themselves, no pity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is inevitable that we are going to become a mestizo/maroon society, with Spanish becoming the dominant language of the working class.

White folks will become rare. And so what?

M

Queequeg said:

Coming to terms with reality has hardly ever figured in an American presidential election... why would that become relevant now? People waiving Mexican flags protesting scared white people having a rally is just going to tend to galvanize those scared white people, was my point.

Malcolm wrote:

Poor scared white people...boo hoo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Queequeg said:

People who are on the fence but are concerned with immigration are going to find the waiving of a foreign flag, ESPECIALLY A MEXICAN FLAG, at an American political rally energized by xenophobia confirming their fears. Things like that are just going to

energize Trump voters to get out and vote.

Malcolm wrote:

There are more people of Native American and African descent in the Americas than white people. The latter should figure this out.

Queequeg said:

I don't follow your point...

Malcolm wrote:

It is inevitable that we are going to become a mestizo/maroon society, with Spanish becoming the dominant language of the working class.

White folks will become rare. And so what?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dependent origination was never taught to explain the nature of things. It was taught only explain the process of delusion and how to reverse it.

Astus said:

I did not refer to the 12 links only, but the general concept of causality. Three examples:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Patthana>,

<http://www.chinabuddhismencyclopedia.com/en/index.php/Paratantra>,

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indra%27s_net.

Malcolm wrote:

Even so, this does not go beyond delusion.

Astus said:

Second, there are no "things" for which dependent origination is the nature.

"No things" is exactly what dependent origination is about. But illusory doesn't mean nothing.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, illusions are not "nothing" since there is no "something" in an illusion to negate or to become nonexistent.

Astus said:

since the eight consciousness are strictly deluded, there can be no buddhahood in

them.

That's when they "turn into" the four wisdoms. But it's just the same old body-mind without delusion.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it isn't.

Astus said:

There can be no time, conditions, causes, etc., in a real sense.

It's all in an unreal sense. That's the whole point of emptiness, to see how unreal everything is. And they are all already unreal just as they are. The only error is this deluded idea of a real self, real substance. There is no error in a bowl of soup, or a pair of socks. The error is imagining them to be anything that they are not.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a subtle reification of things. Your view here is very much the same as the Gelugpa view.

Astus said:

Since the the all-basis consciousness is the imputing nature, it is very active.

Do you experience the innumerable seeds replicating themselves every moment, waiting to be ripened in an unknown future time?

Malcolm wrote:

All delusion is the experience of seeds/traces.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

MiphamFan said:

Malcolm, but unlike Rongzom you said earlier in this thread that sadhana practice does not develop the sutric dhyanas?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not their main function, no. Look, you can generate dhyāna on a pile of dung.

The sūtric dhyānas are not a buddhist practice, per se., as I already outlined.

We can even see this neurologically — sadhana practices result in the activation of the

sympathetic system, inducing heightened cognitive competence; while classical Theravada meditation, Zen, Kagyu Mahāmudra, etc., increases parasympathetic activity, inducing states of relaxation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Astus said:

The problem is, that aside from the five sense organ consciousness, all the three others can be described as conceptual consciousnesses

The reason I said it's the 6th, is because both the 7th and 8th are latent. They are proposed in order to set up a fairly coherent theoretical model, but nobody ever actually experiences them, they are practically non-functional.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not the case. Since the the all-basis consciousness is the imputing nature, it is very active.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Strange that they says this. It means that either you have not understood them, or that they are wrong.

Astus said:

As for Huineng, it wasn't given much weight anywhere - as far as I am aware -, probably because it is a short discussion between him and an advocate of the Nirvana Sutra. The exception is Dogen, who used that bit to turn it into an attack on a prevalent interpretation of buddha-mind. While it was Dogen who made that interpretation one of the main elements of his teachings, as he shows by a number of quotations, the common reification of buddha-nature has been pointed out by teachers before him as well. More on Dogen's buddha-nature interpretation: http://global.sotozen-net.or.jp/eng/library/key_terms/pdf/key_terms13.pdf, <http://www.lionsroar.com/impermanence-is-buddha-nature-embrace-changemay-2012/>, <http://terebess.hu/zen/dogen/Kodera-Dogen.pdf>, <https://books.google.com/books?id=AmKE2xljOwcC>.

Mipham states:

As I see it, the dual qualities of emptiness-awareness can be applied perfectly well to the five aggregates, in the sense that they are without essence, and at the same time exist as experiences. But assuming that there is something beyond, an eternal knower, is just a self-view.

Malcolm wrote:

You have not grasped the point. The notion of conditioned/unconditioned depend on reification. They depend on the notion of time and entities being real.

When you insist that emptiness is only the emptiness of dependently origination things, this is wrong on two counts. Dependent origination was never taught to explain the nature of things. It was taught only explain the process of delusion and how to reverse it. Second, there are no "things" for which dependent origination is the nature.

Since the conditioned is not established, it goes without saying that the unconditioned is not established.

However, since the eight consciousness are strictly deluded, there can be no buddhahood in them. Since pristine consciousness is free from conditions, time, entities, concepts and so on, only in it can buddhahood be found. When it is said that self-originated pristine consciousness is unconditioned and beyond the eight consciousness, this means that one has realized that there is also no basis for dependent origination nor the conditioned, not to mention the unconditioned. The real meaning of dependent origination is nonorigination. There can be no time, conditions, causes, etc., in a real sense. This is why there is no buddhahood in the mind because the mind [citta] is always conceptual, always bound causes, conditions, time, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

fckw said:

I don't see why one should take such promises in Dzogchen tantras literally, but not the Bible or the Coran.

Malcolm wrote:

That all depends on whether you regard them definitive or not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Queequeg said:

People who are on the fence but are concerned with immigration are going to find the waiving of a foreign flag, ESPECIALLY A MEXICAN FLAG, at an American political rally energized by xenophobia confirming their fears. Things like that are just going to energize Trump voters to get out and vote.

Malcolm wrote:

There are more people of Native American and African descent in the Americas than white people. The latter should figure this out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 30th, 2016 at 12:49 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So for you Buddhamind is conditioned, therefore it is impermanent.

Astus said:

On the one hand, that's what Huineng and Dogen says, that buddha-mind is impermanent. On the other, supposing a buddha outside of one's mind (buddha-nature beyond the five aggregates) makes it an unattainable theory.

Malcolm wrote:

Strange that they says this. It means that either you have not understood them, or that they are wrong.

Mipham states:

Therefore, the original mind is dharmatā emptiness, the luminous mind that does not become solely empty by nature or an inert emptiness and is called self-originated pristine consciousness. Since there isn't an iota of a characteristic of conditioned or unconditioned apart from being intrinsically clear emptiness, it [original mind] is beyond the inert composed of particles, clarity which possesses subject and object, and a knowing consciousness. It is to be realized with personal knowledge that sees the true state. It has no correlation with the group of eight consciousnesses. Since the apprehending subject and apprehended objects of concepts and signs have never existed in the dharmatā of the union of knowing and emptiness, the signs of dualistic phenomena such as samsara and nirvana, delusion and liberation, self and other, beginning and end, and so on, have never existed in it since it naturally abide in uniform nonconceptuality.

Astus said:

The presentation you provide of yogacara i really dont agree with. Try sourcing from Asanga.

Do you have a quote perhaps, to give the interpretation of manas and manovijnana you agree with?

Malcolm wrote:

My error, I conflated vijñāna of the five aggregates with the presentation of manovijñāna in yogacara. Nevertheless, there is still a distinction to be made here. The

Mahāyānasamgraha states:

Mental discernment (manovijñāpti) is the reason for discerning that the eye and so forth

encounter phenomena. The discernment of mental consciousness possesses a view. Mental consciousness is conceptual because discernment generates all appearances. The problem is, that aside from the five sense organ consciousness, all the three others can be described as conceptual consciousnesses, which still makes your presentation from Living Yogacara ill-suited. The Mahāyānasamgraha states:

The the concept of the foundation is the all-basis consciousness.

Vasubandhu expands on this slightly:

Since the fundamental concept is "imputation," it is defined as the foundation of concepts, that is also the all-basis consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2016 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So for you Buddhamind is conditioned, therefore it is impermanent.

The presentation you provide of yogacara i really dont agree with. Try sourcing from Asanga.

I didn't mention it. The sūtras maintain this is so. They also maintain that dharmakāya is jñāna. Draw your own conclusions.

Astus said:

Unconditioned knowing is not possible, unless one accepts a soul. So, the meaning is something else.

Mano-vijñāna is a nonconceptual consciousness, like the other five sense consciousnesses.

The mano-vijnana is the thinking mind, the one with all the thoughts and ideas, i.e. concepts. It is also the one that becomes discerning wisdom (pratyavekṣaṇājñāna / 妙觀察智). So, what you seem to be saying is that conceptuality is non-conceptual. Manas only adds the grasping at self, and a number of basic defilements.

The first mind as subjective transformer is the ālaya-vijñāna. The ālayavijñāna flawlessly retains all of our past experiences, and recognizes and contextualizes things as we cognize them. our experiences, according to their depth and significance upon our lives, are difficult to remove.

The second subjective transformer is the manas. in this case, objects of cognition are transformed by a deep attachment to the self, and the resulting tendencies to protect and further that self.

Then, already subject to these subconscious influences, the cognitive function of the thinking consciousness and the five sense consciousnesses—that is, the discrimination of things — arises.

(Tagawa Shun'ei: Living Yogacara, p 17)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2016 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Did we all fail at Dzogchen?

Content:

Boomerang said:

It's also said that practitioners of lower capacity will be reborn in pure lands. So, if we are here reading dharmawheel and not in Dewachen,

florin said:

You seem to be suggesting that the default position is that any dzogchen practitioner who is considered as having a low capacity will be reborn in pure lands.

I don't think that is the case bearing in mind that the category of low capacity has 3 subcategories the high low, middle low and the low low.

Malcolm wrote:

There are actually 21 capacities discussed in the Dzogchen tantras, only the best of the best attain rainbow body in this life. The rest are liberated in the bardo, and the last four or so of the average take rebirth in nirmanakāya buddhahelds, or at worst, places where they can meet Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2016 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Amoxicillin does not generate profound life-transforming experiences for people, entheogens do, regularly.

Sherab Dorje said:

I would say that being saved from death via some, now that Amoxicillin exists, insignificant infection is pretty bloody profound and life-transforming!

Malcolm wrote:

But it really does not change people's outlook in a profound way. It just doesn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2016 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

MiphamFan said:

Malcolm, what about the time you quoted Rongzom saying the factors for the first Dhyana are necessary for Dzogchen and sadhana practice helps achieve it?

Malcolm wrote:

He said that these five factors are necessary for those who do not understand Dzogchen,

and need to practice gradually maintaining an intellectual view of Dzogchen. He also said it does not matter whether you practice sūtra style śamatha or sadhana practice, and not to be biased either way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2016 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We have already seen that dharmakāya is defined as the buddha's jñāna, his pristine consciousness, which is characterized by the twin omniscience.

Astus said:

You also mentioned before that the dharmakaya is unconditioned.

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't mention it. The sūtras maintain this is so. They also maintain that dharmakāya is jñāna. Draw your own conclusions.

Astus said:

Which mind? Certainly not the eight consciousnesses. For example, which mind among the eight consciousnesses is operative in the realization of emptiness?

Realisation of emptiness is the elimination of the wrong concept of essence. That ignorance is removed from the mind (the 8th in the 8 consciousnesses system) by correct discernment (of the 6th).

Malcolm wrote:

No. Mano-vijñāna is a nonconceptual consciousness, like the other five sense consciousnesses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2016 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Zen Language

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

That's interesting Astus. On a related note, what is the sort of cultural history of Zen poetry involving depictions of the natural world?

Malcolm wrote:

It has its origins in Song dynasty neo-confucian literati. All of the so called "Zen arts" are really Confucian arts, the skills cultivated by educated Chinese gentleman, calligraphy,

archery, etc.

Queequeg said:

But they've been recast by literati who also internalized Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

The forms and conventions are all neo-confucian, and indeed, Japan, by the time we think of the "Zen Arts" coming into play had ceased being a "Buddhist" country and had adopted Neo-confucianism as the main intellectual culture, because it served better to bolster the military and the ruling class.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2016 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Ayu said:

Anyway, my main interest was on this question:

Can anybody supply this thread with quotes from lamas about hallucinogenic drugs?
Didn't even Chögyam Trungpa discourage his students to take it?

Malcolm wrote:

Trungpa tripped with his students, fairly often.

Ayu said:

Okay, and what did he say exactly about it?

(I give up, if nobody wants to answer.)

Malcolm wrote:

It is said that he described LSD as a double samsara, but he used it often enough that I suspect this was a quip, and not his real point of view. It was a tool, he used it to help students get past blocks and barriers they were having on the path. You can read about this in various bios and personal accounts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2016 at 12:33 AM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

It seems to me you are trying establish a causal relationship where none exists. For every hippy that took LSD and decided to dabble in Dharma there are countless of Buddhist practitioners that never even toked on a joint in their life.

Malcolm wrote:

I have met very few of them.

Sherab Dorje said:

I would dare to say that the LSD to (somewhat serious) Dharma practice phenomenon would be so insignificant that it would make it statistically completely and utterly irrelevant.

Malcolm wrote:

You have apparently never spent much time in the US.

Sherab Dorje said:

Yes, some hippies did go on to practice Dharma after taking LSD, many-many-many more did not.

Malcolm wrote:

My point was that in my generation, the vast majority of people who tuned in Dharma, first tuned into LSD.

Sherab Dorje said:

Amoxicillin has also proved effective in fighting many infections, but nobody seems to be trying to build a religious cult around it,

Malcolm wrote:

Amoxicillin does not generate profound life-transforming experiences for people, entheogens do, regularly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 29th, 2016 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Ayu said:

Anyway, my main interest was on this question:

Karma Dorje said:

... As he alludes, and as Ivo has mentioned, some lamas are supportive of such exploration so it really is between guru and student. ...

Ayu said:

I was browsing this thread but didn't find any genuine source for "lamas who are supportive" for the use of Ayahuasca. Who? And what kind of support? Do they encourage taking hallucinogens?

Can anybody supply this thread with quotes from lamas about hallucinogenic drugs? Didn't even Chögyam Trungpa discourage his students to take it?

Malcolm wrote:
Trungpa tripped with his students, fairly often.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, April 29th, 2016 at 12:03 AM
Title: Re: AYAHUASCA
Content:

Sherab Dorje said:
I don't think I said that he didn't know about getting shit faced on psychedelics. He has 20 years experience of that after all...

Malcolm wrote:
No one gets "shitfaced" on entheogens.

Sherab Dorje said:
Yes, this is a very positive thing, but my question is: What is his motivation for building this bridge with Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:
It is gonna be built whether you like it or not. And as you may have noticed, many people (I'd say most) in my generation (baby-boomers) used entheogens as a bridge to Dharma, whether you accept that or not, or like it or not.

Further, there are clinical uses for these compounds — both LSD and Psilocybin have shown very promising results in working with addiction, PTSD, easing fear of death, and so on. These drugs are powerful and therapeutic, which is why cultures all over the world have returned to their use again and again for many millenia.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2016 at 11:48 PM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2
Content:

DGA said:
Libertarianism is, in the last analysis, about property and not people.

Malcolm wrote:
Rightwing libertarianism, of the Rand/Rothbart ilk, yes. Not the leftwing libertarianism of the Green Party, etc.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2016 at 11:46 PM
Title: Re: Zen Language

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

That's interesting Astus. On a related note, what is the sort of cultural history of Zen poetry involving depictions of the natural world?

Malcolm wrote:

It has its origins in Song dynasty neo-confucian literati. All of the so called "Zen arts" are really Confucian arts, the skills cultivated by educated Chinese gentleman, calligraphy, archery, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2016 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Ayu said:

Browsing this thread I found Malcolms believe, so-called flash-backs are non-existent. Man, you are very fortunate to have this impression. Good Karma. But if you wanted to raise this thesis as a truth, you don't have to take your acquaintances as reference. Better make interviews in mental hospitals. They will assure you: flash-backs exist and they are an unpredictable risk.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, I don't buy it. I have been around the mental health system for many years, and while it is certainly true that people who are at congenital risk for schizophrenia can accelerate the onset of that disease by an average of two years by using LSD, in general, there is no such thing as a "flashback" (in the classic, scary sense of the term) from taking LSD.

PTSD, etc., this is a completely different issue. But here we are talking about neurological damage to nerve pathways caused by excess stress in combat, accidents, repeated abuse, and while it is the case that we see that kind of damage from cocaine, methamphetamine, and so on, so far no one has ever demonstrated any neurological damage resulting from using LSD, Psilocybin, Mescaline, DMT, etc. Part of the problem of course is that no one is allowed to do research on these compounds in any systematic way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2016 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

DGA said:

Europeans are right to be concerned about Trump. I think all of us should be concerned about the rise of far-right politics globally.

treehuggingoctopus said:

We should be more than just concerned. These forces must be stopped before it is too late -- before we find ourselves re-living not the collapse of the Weimar Republic (it is all already here) but the late Thirties. Any day now...

Malcolm wrote:

Voting for Hillary Clinton is just not the answer to this. Since it seems the Democrats are bound and determined to lose this election to Donald J. Trump by nominating Hillary Rodham Clinton, I will return to voting for the Green Party as I have done in the past.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2016 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Fightin' Monks

Content:

Queequeg said:

The trio of fight participants — who were all mid-level managers — were dismissed by the temple.

<http://www.nydailynews.com/news/world/monks-involved-brawl-front-chinese-temple-article-1.2617411>

Setting aside the disgraceful impression this makes...

I'm not sure what "dismissed" means, but for the sake of argument, let's say this was "defeat" in the Vinaya sense. Is fighting an offense that amounts to defeat?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2016 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Enlightenment of Robots?

Content:

Queequeg said:

Longquan temple says it has developed a robot monk that can chant Buddhist mantras, move via voice command, and hold a simple conversation.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/us-china-religion-robot-idUSKCN0XJ05I>

Is the robot a fancy prayer wheel? or a practitioner?

Malcolm wrote:

The former.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2016 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Astus said:

I don't hold the dharmakaya to be anything, not even blank void. It is just a term for the emptiness side of buddha-mind, while the rupakaya accounts for the aware, functional side.

Malcolm wrote:

Clearly, your opinion of this is not really well founded. We have already seen that dharmakāya is defined as the buddha's jñāna, his pristine consciousness, which is characterized by the twin omniscience.

Astus said:

One realises things with the mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Which mind? Certainly not the eight consciousnesses. For example, which mind among the eight consciousnesses is operative in the realization of emptiness?

Astus said:

If dharmakaya means the enlightened mind, what are the other kayas?

Malcolm wrote:

Enlightened speech and body.

Another way it is put is that all kāyās at the time of the basis (before any realization occurs at all) are the dharmakāya. All kāyas at the time of the path are sambhogakāya. All kāyas at the time of the result are the nirmanakāya.

Mapping the three kāyas to the clarity and emptiness of the mind, as I pointed out already, is from the point of view of the explaining the basis of the three kāyas, not their realization. We can say that emptiness corresponds to dharmakāya because dharmakāya is the the ultimate realization of the nature of reality. We can say that clarity corresponds to the sambhogakāya because clarity is evident and distinct and the sambhogakāya emerges as a visible result, and so on. There are many ways to parse these things. But parsing things in this way does not mean that the emptiness of one's mind is the resultant dharmakāya, such arguments destroy the path. Why, because the basis has not been realized in a proper way and that basis and the result are confused.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2016 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

It's not ADHD at all. Sherab Dorje is an Aussie (by upbringing, at least) and that means that like me he has an exquisitely sensitive bullshit detector. Mine has saved me more wasted hours than I can count, and I'm sure SD would say the same of his.

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

Your BS detector is highly over-rated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2016 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

AlexMcLeod said:

As a student of history and economics in my personal life, I cannot support anyone who proposes that government can solve societal problems. Only people on an individual level can do that. That is why I must vote Johnson again this year.

Malcolm wrote:

Guess you don't like the solutions presented by roads and sanitation much, nor national health care, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2016 at 9:19 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, the following is a completely wrong view.

Wayfarer said:

'The Dharmakaya is a soul, a willing and knowing being, one that is will and intelligence, thought and action. It is not an abstract metaphysical principle like Suchness, but it is a living spirit that manifests in nature as well as in thought. Buddhists ascribe to the Dharmakaya innumerable merits and virtues and an absolute perfect intelligence, and make it an inexhaustible fountainhead of love and compassion' D T Suzuki Outlines of Mahayana Buddhism

'The Dharmakaya, though manifesting itself in the triple world (past, present, and future), is free from impurities and desires. It unfolds itself here, there, and everywhere,

responding to the call of karma. It is not an individual reality, it is not a false existence, but is universal and pure. It comes from nowhere, it goes to nowhere; it does not assert itself, nor is it subject to annihilation. It is forever serene and eternal. It is the One, devoid of all determinations. This Body of Dharma has no boundary, no quarters, but is embodied in all bodies. Its freedom or spontaneity is incomprehensible, its spiritual presence in things corporeal is incomprehensible. All forms of corporeality are involved therein; it is able to create all things. Assuming any concrete material body as required by the nature and condition of karma, it illuminates all creations. Though it is the treasure of intelligence it is void of particularity. There is no place in the universe where this Body does not prevail. The universe becomes, but this Body forever remains. It is free from all opposites and contraries, yet it is working in all things to lead them to Nirvana.'

Suzuki, commentary on Avatamsaka Sutra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2016 at 7:15 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Furthermore, the next fault is that a blank void cannot be a source of anything, and dharmakāya is the source of the two rūpakāyas.

catmoon said:

It take it you are not much concerned with the findings of modern science on this subject.

Malcolm wrote:

I dont think modern science supports the view that a blank void can be source of anything at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2016 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Comissioning Naga offering pujas

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Placation is always easier than attempting to overpower.

The weakest can easily placate even the strongest foe through offering.

Overpowering and destruction should always be the last options taken.

Malcolm wrote:

Sometimes, you have to straight to the nuclear option.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2016 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, you don't have to change anything.

Astus said:

If the dharmakaya includes both emptiness and awareness, what do sambhogakaya and nirmanakaya stand for?

Malcolm wrote:

In which system? In which context?

I am talking about the three kāyas of the result. Your comments, especially the comments from Kongtrul and so on are derived from discussions about the three kāyas of the basis, but they are not the actual three kāyas.

If you claim, as you have, that dharmakāya is only emptiness, there is the fault that dharmakāya will be a blank void. The dharmakāya is realization of emptiness, the realization of dharmatā. That realization is nondual with emptiness, but it still is a realization. A blank void cannot realize anything.

Furthermore, the next fault is that a blank void cannot be a source of anything, and dharmakāya is the source of the two rūpakāyas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 28th, 2016 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

is a term used to describe the mind of a buddha. It is not simply an term describing a blank insentient emptiness.

Astus said:

Then you have to change the roles given to sambhogakaya and nirmanakaya as the functional aspects. Because where dharmakaya refers to emptiness, the three bodies together make up a complete buddha-mind, and they do not exist separately.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you don't have to change anything. It is very clear that sūtra states dharmakāya is the jñāna of a buddha.

Astus said:

Kanthā. It means anything that lacks a mind.

Interesting. In the dictionaries online it translates to "rag, patched garment; wall, town". But if it means anything mindless, how is it specifically for rocks?

Malcolm wrote:

If it is for everything, it is also for rocks.

Astus said:

That is how it is parsed in some Vajrayāna contexts, but never in sūtra, where it is generally treated as synonym of dharmakāya.

Maybe in TB, but have not encountered with it in EAB. But their unity is known:

"The dharmakāya, sambhogakāya, and nirmāṇakāya—

The three bodies are fundamentally a single body.

If one can see it oneself within the nature,

This is the cause of bodhi and the achievement of buddhahood."

(Platform Sutra, ch 10, BDK Edition, p 90)

Malcolm wrote:

The three kāyas are inseparable, just as your body, speech and mind are inseparable.

Three aspects, one entity.

Astus said:

"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 dharmakaya, its clarity is nirmanakaya, and the union of those is sambhogakaya."

(Jamgon Kongtrul on Mahamudra of the Shangpa Kagyu, in The Treasury of Knowledge: Book Eight, Part Four: Esoteric Instructions, p 246).....

Malcolm wrote:

You can parse it like this, and this is very characteristic of the new tantra schools, where dharmakāya is related to the emptiness aspect of the nature of the mind, but that is not the real dharmakāya. As we already saw dharmakāya = jñānakāya.

The Śrī Māladevi Sūtra states:

The dharmakāya of the tathāgatas is space-like pristine consciousness, the kāya of the pristine consciousness of the tathāgatas.

Vasubandhu's commentary on the Dasabhumī Sūtra states very clearly:

With respect to that, the first deliverance is the dharmakāya that exists only through pristine consciousness, devoid of mind, intellect, or consciousness. Why? Because dharmakāya is the kāya of pristine consciousness.

The Amṛtamañjarī, a commentary on the Saṃputa Tantra states:

The kāya of pristine consciousness is the dharmakāya.

The Vimalaprabha, commentary on Kālacakra states:

The omniscient kāya of pristine consciousness is the innate nature of the victors and is likewise the dharmakāya.

The Great Tantra Clarifying The Meaning of Freedom From Proliferation states:

Since there are no causes and conditions in the dharmakāya, self-originated pristine consciousness, it is not conditioned.

The Tantra of the Dimension Of Samantabhadra's Pristine Consciousness, The Most Refined Gold states:

The buddhas of the three times are free from mind [sems].

Since they lack the group of eight consciousnesses, they also lack the mind.

The self-originated essence, dharmakāya, is the pristine consciousness that does not arise from mind.

Mipham says about this:

It must be understood that pristine consciousness does not arise from the mind because the reality of the mind is natural luminosity, just as emptiness, the dharmatā of all entities, is the reality of entities but does not arise from entities.

Furthermore, the Tantra of the View of the Great Perfection, Perfect Deep Pristine Consciousness states:

Since this self-originated essence that has always existed was not produced from a cause nor generated by a condition, be confident that the self-originated pristine consciousness is the dharmakāya that was not fabricated through any sort of effort.

Mipham further states:

However, that dharmakāya, the original knowing and empty pristine consciousness, does not need to be based on methods with characteristics such as the cessation the vāyu in the central channel and so on. [20/a] If there is no contraction between the empowerment that transfers the blessings of the guru and our own path of the Great Perfection's introduction of the mind essence as the dharmakāya that actualizes the transcendent state (dgongs pa) of the nonarising original purity of one's own mind, the pristine consciousness that resembles that is the meaning pristine consciousness indicated by the fourth empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2016 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So here your definition of dharmakāya = emptiness is inadequate, since it would leave dharmakāya as an inert void.

Astus said:

Dharmakaya...

Malcolm wrote:

is a term used to describe the mind of a buddha. It is not simply a term describing a blank insentient emptiness.

Astus said:

No, but they do have a word for the insentience of rocks.
What is it?

Malcolm wrote:

Kanthā. It means anything that lacks a mind.

Astus said:

As for as there being more than three bodies of the buddha, that very much depends on whether one considers svabhāvakāya to be a synonym for dharmakāya or not. I am inclined to think it is a synonym.

As for the fourth body, I think it's just an extra emphasis on the oneness of the three bodies.

Malcolm wrote:

That is how it is parsed in some Vajrayāna contexts, but never in sūtra, where it is generally treated as synonym of dharmakāya. Haribhadra seems to be the first person to really make a real distinction between dharmakāya and svabhāvakāya, but it is controversial, and at least in Tibetan Buddhism, only accepted by the Gelugpas.

Astus said:

Linji said it all (p 19, tr Sasaki): "They are just empty names, and these names are also empty."

Malcolm wrote:

it is easy to reduce everything to nihilism with flippant quotes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2016 at 10:12 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Astus said:

Dharmakaya refers to the ultimate nature of buddhas, and that is emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not really square with sūtra:

For example, the commentary of the Lanka states:

"'The buddhas are the dharmakāya,' and it is said there are no bones, blood or so in the body (kāya) because that is a kāya of pristine consciousness (jñāna)."

So here your definition of dharmakāya = emptiness is inadequate, since it would leave dharmakāya as an inert void.

Astus said:

It seems that Buddhist thinkers did not bother with creating a special word for the insubstantiality of rocks. Note: dharmakaya is just one of the three/four bodies, so it is not all there is to a buddha/mind.

Malcolm wrote:

No, but they do have a word for the insentience of rocks.

As for as there being more than three bodies of the buddha, that very much depends on whether one considers svabhāvakāya to be a synonym for dharmakāya or not. I am inclined to think it is a synonym.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2016 at 9:33 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

#Bernieorbust

frank123 said:

Unfortunately its bust for you.

Malcolm wrote:

It aint over till its over. He is going to the convention. And, I will never vote for Hillary Clinton...(or Donald Trump).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2016 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If seeing the mind = seeing tathāgatagarbha, than this makes mind unconditioned or tathāgatagarbha conditioned, but undesirable consequences.

Astus said:

There is no such thing as the unconditioned. Unconditioned means unbound, empty.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you mean by "thing." I mean "dharma", and as such, there are indeed unconditioned dharmas, for example, space, cessation, emptiness, tathāgatagarbha, luminosity and so on.

Astus said:

Seeing the mind means recognising that it's empty and conditioned, and by that one is not conditioned any more by imagined essences. So as they say, the emptiness is the

dharmakaya, the awareness is the sambhogakaya, and appearances are the nirmanakaya.

Malcolm wrote:

If emptiness = the dharmakāya, then is the dharmakāya is just something inert, like a rock?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2016 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016, part 2

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

#Bernieorbust

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2016 at 8:17 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Astus said:

whereby seeing the mind becomes seeing buddha-nature. But that still leaves space for a gradual development.

Malcolm wrote:

If seeing the mind = seeing tathāgatagarbha, than this makes mind unconditioned or tathāgatagarbha conditioned, but undesirable consequences.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2016 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Ok, that still confuses me about what is actually introduced or pointed out (and not from an experiential standpoint, simply from the theoretical standpoint of this convo), but your earlier explanation made it a little clearer...it still sounds like you are saying something like the child luminosity is not actual luminosity, but maybe it's just the labels confusing me.

Malcolm wrote:

Tathāgatagarbha theory is important in Dzogchen, Kagyu and the Jonang school. It is not important in Gelug and Sakya. Your teachers are mainly Sakya.

Johnny Dangerous said:

I'm still utterly confused about the implications of this, and again am interested in whether there is "partial awareness" of it, and if not, why not.

Malcolm wrote:

No, just as there is no partial awareness of dharmakāya, there is partial awareness of tathāgatagarbha.

Johnny Dangerous said:

If there's no partial awareness of it, through introduction or pointing out, then I don't understand how taking result as path makes sense.

Malcolm wrote:

"Taking the result as the path" simply means visualizing our aggregates, elements and sense bases as a pure buddha mandala and cultivating divine pride. It doesn't really have anything to do with tathāgatagarbha theory.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2016 at 11:12 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Yes, I understand that Cone, my question was more about the topic of Malcolms saying it is not possible to "experience" (or use the term realize, recognize or whatever, experience probably IS a bad term, but it is after all just a term) Buddha Nature at all until one is a Buddha, and how that works. If the answer is just that it can't be described, and is outside the range of conceptuality well yeah, I get that. It seemed like a more specific claim to me.

Malcolm wrote:

As the citation I mentioned states, not even 10th stage bodhisattvas have anything more than a rough idea about sugatagarbha. This has very little to do with introduction vs. analysis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2016 at 3:59 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

That is not really something I have heard said by any of my teachers, unless I've misunderstood their teachings, and that's why I'm asking you for clarification.

Malcolm wrote:

Direct introduction uses three experiences: bliss, clarity and conceptuality to point to the nature of the mind. But the "nature of the mind" being pointed to is an example wisdom, not a result of analysis. It resembles the wisdom of buddhahood, but is not it. However, since it is not a result of analysis, it is easier to actualize the real nature of the mind based on introduction, or so the theory runs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2016 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

What's an example wisdom? Direct perception of what?

Malcolm wrote:

That, my friend, you must hear from a qualified guru.

Johnny Dangerous said:

I already have qualified teachers, I'm asking the question in regards to the conversation and overall topic. I don't see why you can't answer it.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, you need to hear this from your guru.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2016 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Whenever I read Sutra, Shastra and Tantra, I try to do so (initially) without referring to commentaries.

Malcolm wrote:

Not a sound practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2016 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

...what are we introduced to in direct introduction and pointing out instruction"?

Malcolm wrote:

An example wisdom based on direct perception.

Johnny Dangerous said:

What's an example wisdom? Direct perception of what?

Malcolm wrote:

That, my friend, you must hear from a qualified guru.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2016 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Saoshun said:

Why do you equal totalitarianism with republic?

Malcolm wrote:

Because the classical republic, which you claim to esteem, is a class-based totalitarian system in which only a certain constituents even had rights at all, including and especially the right to elect an assembly to represent their interests.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2016 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

...what are we introduced to in direct introduction and pointing out instruction"?

Malcolm wrote:

An example wisdom based on direct perception.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2016 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Its nature is without beginning, middle, or end;
hence [the state of a buddha] is uncreated.

Since it possesses the peaceful dharmakaya,
it is described as being "spontaneously present."
Since it must be realized through self-awareness,
it is not a realization due to extraneous conditions.
Uttaratantra Shastra

And that's just page two. What is being said here seems to have no bearing at all to what has been said in this thread over the past few pages.

Malcolm wrote:
The translation is a little wrong:

Should be:
Because it is a nature without beginning, middle or end,
it is unconditioned.
Because it is peaceful and the dharmakāya's possession,
it is called "effortless"
Since it must be realized by each one for themselves,
it cannot be realized through other conditions.
Now then, Asanga's comment on "dharmakāya's possession" states, "it is seen distinctly by the dharmakāya."

And as the Nirvana Sūtra states several times:
Son of a good family, though tathāgatagarbha exists in their bodies, even tenth stage bodhisattvas see only a rough approximation of it.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, April 27th, 2016 at 12:06 AM
Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?
Content:
Sherab Dorje said:
In which case Buddhism is reduced to yet another religiously based ethical system to ensure social cohesion.

Malcolm wrote:
That is one valuable aspect of Dharma, to be sure.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 at 11:56 PM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016
Content:

Saoshun said:
It's called democracy.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, so you prefer monarchy, tyranny...?

Saoshun said:

Republic in classical sense (not the way US people understand republicans) with empowerment of law and freedom based. Tax free of course, besides VAT tax and little taxes. No social help...

Malcolm wrote:

So, rightwing class-based totalitarianism, in essence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 at 11:55 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

I really think you need to study the Uttaratantra.

Where in the Uttaratantra is this particular concept of Buddha nature being unattainable mentioned?

Malcolm wrote:

Tathāgatgarbha is not unattainable. But it is something can only be perceived by Buddhas, since it is the dharmakāya.

Johnny Dangerous said:

All the similes (the part which sticks out in my mind) I don't remember saying anything like this, only that it is necessary to remove obscurations.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they must be removed completely, otherwise, it cannot be seen.

Johnny Dangerous said:

It seems like it would be more clarifying to explain the question about direct introduction, pointing out, etc., since if what you are saying is true, then taking result as path doesn't make sense.

Malcolm wrote:

Taking the result as the path is a method. It is not actual, one is not taking the actual result as the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Bristollad said:

Kakistocracy is a form of government where the least qualified individuals are in power. Some argue that all governments eventually break down into this; others argue they all start that way. Many believe that not to engage in matters of power and government is tantamount to voting for Kakistocracy.

Saoshun said:

It's called democracy.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, so you prefer monarchy, tyranny...?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

If the Tathagatagarbha is primordial and unconditioned and beyond the range of samsaric beings then it would follow that:

a) There is no reason to engage in wholesome actions because the Tathagatagarbha cannot be realised via them and there is no reason NOT to carry out unwholesome actions because the Tathagatagarbha cannot be effected/tainted by them.

b) There is no way to become enlightened since our enlightened "bit" is already enlightened and can only be approached by the enlightened anyway.

c) Samsara and Nirvana are mutually exclusive.

Seems to me to miss the whole point of Buddhism since it is the UNenlightened (ignorant) that need to be enlightened.

AND, like JD asked but did not receive a response to: How does this all fit into the schema of direct introduction??? Theoretically, I cannot be introduced to anything since it is beyond my capacity as a samsaric being...

Malcolm wrote:

I really think you need to study the Uttaratantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Saoshun said:

I would do not vote if even if I could....history always repeats itself.

Malcolm wrote:

The reason for the second half can be found in the first.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 at 6:52 AM

Title: Re: Enlightenment and Phenomena

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All phenomena are one unique bindu.

Queequeg said:

Can you clarify that?

Each phenomena is a unique point or all phenomena are essentially one?

Malcolm wrote:

They are all contained in one state without any edges or corners.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 at 6:44 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Now apparently I have this thing (which is not a thing) called the Tahagatagarbha, the source (for want of a better word) of enlightenment and liberation.

Malcolm wrote:

Whoever told you that?

The teaching of tathagātagarbha is supposed to be encouraging, but it is never said anywhere it is something like an engine of liberation operating in the background. As the Uttaratantra states:

Why is it taught "Buddhagarbha exists?"

It is to abandon five faults

in whomever they exist:

timidity, criticizing sentient beings as inferior,

holding the true to be false,

slandering the true Dharma,

and elevating oneself.

It is also never said anywhere in the tathāgatagarbha literature that tathāgatagarbha is within the experiential range of anyone but the buddhas.

It is taught for us to have faith in it, that is all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 at 5:24 AM

Title: Re: Lama Tsultrim Allione/ Tara Mandala Experience?

Content:

DGA said:

To the best of my knowledge, Lama Tsultrim regards him as her root teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is correct, she considers the 16th Karmapa her root guru (so she told me once), and has forged a relationship with the present one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 at 5:20 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Astus said:

However, essentially it means peace of mind, where in the first four stages one's enjoyment of peace calms down, while the formless stages are about refining the object that sustains the attention. Naturally, there is the tendency to elevate holy concepts to unreachable levels, at which point they disappear from practice, while the actual practices are simply renamed. And that's how we have calming meditation with new names in Mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a very idiosyncratic statement. One assumes the author must be intimately familiar with the subject through his own personal experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Tathāgatagarbha is something that can only be seen by buddhas. It cannot even be realized by tenth stage bodhisattvas.

This really is a bit of semantic distinction to me at this point, I am not sure what it is supposed to mean outside of self-referential bhumi literature etc. .

Malcolm wrote:

It means that for everyone else it is a something taken on faith.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 at 4:39 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

But what you are saying is closer to: the beggar knows that the rock is a priceless gem but is incapable even of trying to extract and use it.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is correct.

Sherab Dorje said:

The theory I have read says that all wholesome actions/activities spring from the ālayavijñāna and manifest via the manovijñāna.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no contradiction here: wholesome activities of ordinary persons are nevertheless afflicted, unless those wholesome activities are connected with the path. The ālayavijñāna is entirely afflicted. It only exists so long as there are bijas. When they are gone, it vanishes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 at 4:36 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Ok, then something you can realize, be, however you want to put it, I'll leave the correct wording to you. Nonetheless, this is stated at least in Lions Roar Sutra i'm sure, and in Uttaratantra I think..I can dig out the quote if you want.

Malcolm wrote:

Tathāgatagarbha is something that can only be seen by buddhas. It cannot even be realized by tenth stage bodhisattvas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

If I cannot relate to it then it is pretty bloody useless isn't it? It is like saying to somebody that they possess the rarest and most priceless jewel in the universe but they cannot see it, touch it, feel it, etc... Actually it is locked away in a secret and completely inaccessible safe and only the curators are allowed to look at it.

Johnny Dangerous said:

There are some experiential "proofs" for Tathagatagarbha in the Uttataratantra, and Lions Roar of Queens Srimala Sutra IIRC, basically it goes like: If there were no Buddha nature, what would be there to experience the defilements as a negative thing. So actually, it is something we have some experience of all the time, but do not recognize it as such.

Malcolm wrote:

No. Tathāgatagarbha is unconditioned. It is not something we can "experience."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Saoshun said:

No one, laws are already settled as function of the body and other things, those who can perceive those laws like for example "Volenti non fit iniuria" which makes life very easy. Law must secure freedom of people based on classical thought of law.

Malcolm wrote:

Really, this cannot be taken seriously.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Enlightenment and Phenomena

Content:

MindTheGap said:

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/scholar>

Your motivation for study was never in question, my friend

Malcolm wrote:

The point I am trying to make is that when we study the various tenet systems in a systematic way, it eliminates a lot of conceptuality we might have about this thing or that thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as a pure ālaya in Indian Yogacara.

Sherab Dorje said:

The alaya vijnana is essentially pure, and cannot be tainted by the unwholesome seeds which are contained in it. That is what I was lead to understand as being the view.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are confusing ālaya with the ālayavijñāna. The ālayavijñāna is always with traces/seeds. When they are eradicated, it ceases to exist.

Sherab Dorje said:

In sutra, you can but have mere faith that you possess tathāgatagarbha, other than that, there is no way for you to relate with it. Only buddhas can perceive it.

If I cannot relate to it then it is pretty bloody useless isn't it? It is like saying to somebody that they possess the rarest and most priceless jewel in the universe but they cannot see it, touch it, feel it, etc... Actually it is locked away in a secret and completely inaccessible safe and only the cirators are allowed to look at it.

Malcolm wrote:

Among the metaphors you will read in the Uttaratantra is the metaphor of the beggar who uses a rock for his pillow, not realizing that inside of it is a priceless gem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Saoshun said:

Malcom with all respect to you. I just want to be govern by Law not idiocracy of compulsive human choices based on the emotional-political sausages and games, sheeps can not rule otherwise they will be ruled by thinking they are making a choice - is so damn easy to see, are you guys blind or something? I'm not totalitarian. I'm preaching here SANE freedom regulated by LAW which create responsibility.

Malcolm wrote:

Who sets up the laws?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Tagathāgarbha is unconditioned, it also does not produce any mental phenomena at all.

Sherab Dorje said:

Well that's a strange view. Are you saying that the Dharmakaya has no relation with the phenomenal world? So how do/can I, a phenomenon, relate to my Tathagatagarbha? Is my Tathagatagarbha separate to me? Is there an enlightened Greg, and an unenlightened Greg, and never the twain shall meet?

The "some" I am referring to are the Yogacara.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as a pure ālaya in Indian Yogacara.

In sutra, you can but have mere faith that you possess tathāgatagarbha, other than that, there is no way for you to relate with it. Only buddhas can perceive it.

A study of the Uttaratantra might prove useful for you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 26th, 2016 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: Enlightenment and Phenomena

Content:

MindTheGap said:

Well, I could just as easily say, "Time is relative. See Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity."

but, with all due respect, how does that add to the conversation?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, when you take the time to read the MMK, you will see how it adds to the conversation.

MindTheGap said:

I don't know the MMK. I'm not a scholar of Buddhist philosophy. I was encouraged to make this thread by SD, and so I try to contribute in the way I can. Maybe I don't always do a good job of it - for that I apologize.

If I can find the MMK, perhaps it will lead to more understanding. Thank you for the suggestion.

Malcolm wrote:

Mulamadhyamaka karikas.

We don't study Buddhist philosophy to be scholars, we do so to eliminate our unexamined concepts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2016 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I don't care what "some," whoever they are, say.

Tagathāgarbha is unconditioned, it also does not produce any mental phenomena at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2016 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Saoshun said:

in UK the right wing is more leftist then leftist in many EU countries, when I speak with someone about those topics I just cannot believe people can be that stupid, that why democracy should be banned by law.

Malcolm wrote:

Careful, your inner totalitarian is showing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2016 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

catmoon said:

Footnote to my last post -

The term "buddhi" is, as far as I know, entirely my own invention and I know of no instance in which it has ever been used in scripture.

Malcolm wrote:

It means "intellect" and it is a frequently used Sanskrit term in both Buddhist and non-Buddhist literature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2016 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Enlightenment and Phenomena

Content:

rory said:

Okay I remembered Kukai and the Shingon, Japanese esoteric school (the Chinese one went extinct during the T'ang) reveres Vairocana Buddha and the Mahavairocana Sutra so I think this is where Tibetan Buddhism and East Asian Buddhism meet:

Malcolm wrote:

It is true that the Mahāvairocana-abhisambodhi is an important tantra in Tibetan Buddhism. And one can see a direct line from it through the Sarvatathāgata tattvasamgraha (another text of great importance in Shingon), through the Guhyasamaja, and finally Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2016 at 9:24 PM

Title: Re: Enlightenment and Phenomena

Content:

MindTheGap said:

Well, the thought occurs to me, what about the relativity of time.

Is time as empty as all other phenomena?

Malcolm wrote:

Time is not established. See Nāgārjuna's analysis of time in the MMK.

MindTheGap said:

Well, I could just as easily say, "Time is relative. See Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity."

but, with all due respect, how does that add to the conversation?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, when you take the time to read the MMK, you will see how it adds to the conversation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2016 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What is tathāgatagarbha...

Sherab Dorje said:

It's not really a "what"....and who is able to perceive it?

I think we see manifestations of it every day whenever we observe instances of selfless love, compassion, generosity, ethical behaviour, etc...

Malcolm wrote:

Tathāgatagarbha is the dharmakāya encased within temporary afflictions.

Only Buddhas can see it.

The phenomena you describe above are a result of kusala, positive mental factors, not tathāgatagarbha. Nevertheless, in ordinary person, positive mental factors are afflicted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2016 at 6:05 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no need for the beings of the six realms, or grass, trees or rocks to generate bodhicitta, or have buddhanature; everything has always been the state of Buddhahood from the very beginning. That is the ultimate Tibetan Buddhist view.

Sherab Dorje said:

Now all we need to do is realise this and samsara is suddenly transformed in Sahaloka!

Malcolm wrote:

Sahaloka is the name of this world system. It means "The world that is hard to bear."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2016 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If one does not start from right view, one will never have right meditation.

Sherab Dorje said:

I'm going to play devil's advocate now: If one has received correct instruction on the practice, surely the view will arise based on the object being used. Since all beings possess Buddha Nature it would stand to reason that once the conceptual mind is calmed their Buddha Nature will arise spontaneously REGARDLESS of conceptual view, since one is calming conceptual mind (where all this talk of view is taking place) to ZERO.

Malcolm wrote:

What is tathāgatagarbha and who is able to perceive it?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2016 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, it does not.

Sherab Dorje said:

Sez you. If it did, where are all the Hindus abandoning their philosophies and following Buddhadharma?

What makes you think that they do not? Are you saying that Hindu's (or practitioners of almost any religious system) cannot gain insight into their enlightened nature? They have to have a bit of their hair snipped in order to do so?

Malcolm wrote:

If one does not start from right view, one will never have right meditation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2016 at 5:30 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

This is what I meant when I said that shamata absorption gives rise, spontaneously, to insight.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it does not. If it did, where are all the Hindus abandoning their philosophies and following Buddhadharma?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2016 at 5:29 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

rory said:

I don't think Tibetan Buddhism has such theories, as I think (from a previous discussion on pet deaths) that animals must have a human rebirth. If I'm wrong please post the scholarly source so I can increase my knowledge.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no need for the beings of the six realms, or grass, trees or rocks to generate bodhicitta, or have buddhanature; everything has always been the state of Buddhahood from the very beginning. That is the ultimate Tibetan Buddhist view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2016 at 4:54 AM

Title: Re: Enlightenment and Phenomena

Content:

MindTheGap said:

Well, the thought occurs to me, what about the relativity of time.

Is time as empty as all other phenomena?

Malcolm wrote:

Time is not established. See Nāgārjuna's analysis of time in the MMK.

Losal Samten said:

What of Sapan's moments?

Malcolm wrote:

They have no duration, so they are immune to MMK's reasoning. They are also not able to withstand ultimate analysis, however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2016 at 4:39 AM

Title: Re: Enlightenment and Phenomena

Content:

MindTheGap said:

Well, the thought occurs to me, what about the relativity of time.

Is time as empty as all other phenomena?

Malcolm wrote:

Time is not established. See Nāgārjuna's analysis of time in the MMK.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2016 at 4:22 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Mkoll said:

Thanks for that sutta, but I'm asking for a passage referring to "mindfulness of breathing combined with the four foundations of mindfulness, described famously as the ekayāna, the quick vehicle." Sorry if that wasn't clear.

Bakmoon said:

The opening of the Satipatthana Sutta sounds like what Malcom had in mind, but it isn't put that way. This passage though doesn't address this question directly enough though, so I thought a more explicit example would be beneficial.

Malcolm wrote:

Ānāpānasati sutta, MN 118.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2016 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: Enlightenment and Phenomena

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All phenomena are one unique bindu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2016 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: New Book by Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche: The Guru Drinks Bourbon? (Nov 2016)

Content:

Zla'od said:

To begin with, how can I know how a guru is "supposed" to behave?

Malcolm wrote:

There is an entire literature devoted to how to select a qualified guru, and how to avoid those who are not qualified; likewise, this literature contains advice on how to differentiate qualified students from unqualified students.

Zla'od said:

The notion that once chosen, a guru ought never to be abandoned runs counter to my experience with people who have left cults.

Malcolm wrote:

This notion does not exist in Tibetan Buddhism itself, but there are some people who mistakenly assert this belief.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 25th, 2016 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Astus said:

In other words, disciples like to believe that a teacher has special powers, so they attribute some otherwise ordinary events to those powers. That's not different from calling some events the acts of God.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Astus said:

Also, the very first abhijna includes all sorts of magical powers, that could have definitely helped in spreading and defending the Dharma over the centuries. But clairvoyance and telepathy should have proved useful in several cases, when Buddhist masters had encounters with all sorts of rulers.

Malcolm wrote:

And they have.

Astus said:

We are talking about clairvoyance, manomāyakāyas and so on. What is material about that?

Do you know anyone who has passed some tests for those abilities?

Malcolm wrote:

Why should they have to?

Astus said:

Likely not. At the same time, we don't need to look as far as India to find clairvoyants and such. If, as you say, it is something humanly capable - and it's not as hard as attaining insight into emptiness - I don't see why it is not a common thing.

Malcolm wrote:

Clairvoyance, of the random kind, is not uncommon. Mothers and their children experience it all the time.

Astus said:

Not all people with such capacities are Buddhists, and even Buddhist monks, including the Buddha, have demonstrated their powers openly numerous times according to the stories.

Malcolm wrote:

What makes you think they still don't? As I said, you apparently don't know any real yogis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So please explain to me how the "remaining" bit is not about a type of mental focus. Albeit a loose rather than tight focus. Realistically though even "classical" samatha becomes effortless after a certain degree of familiarisation (like remaining in the natural state), so... I am having problems discerning the difference.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no focus. If you are focused, you are not resting in the nature of the mind, but rather, bound by a thought.

Vasana said:

But then by settling in to the experience of emptiness , 1 of the 3 experiences, one can still rest in the nature of mind if you're not distracted /attached.

Using focus or effort only initially as a means to go beyond it,basically. That is,to arrive at knowledge that it's present at all times. Until that view is realized for one self ,you still need to employ various methods of focus and tranquillity to know it for oneself.

Malcolm wrote:

You never settle in any of the three experiences, if you do, you are settling into a deviation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

People who have such capacities are not supposed to demonstrate them idly, and if they are monks, they are forbidden to do so.

Sherab Dorje said:

Do you believe that "proving" to the world that telepathy can arise as a consequence of dhyana is an idle demonstration?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Anyone who had such abilities would know what you were thinking and avoid you.

Sherab Dorje said:

Why would they avoid me? I mean, apart from the obvious (ie not wanting to see the post-holocaust chaos that is my mind).

Malcolm wrote:

People who have such capacities are not supposed to demonstrate them idly, and if they are monks, they are forbidden to do so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Śamatha in Mahāmudra/Dzogchen is not based on mental one-pointedness, it is based on recognizing and remaining in the nature of the mind pointed out during introduction. It is also vipaśyāna. It also does not matter whether you are seated, standing, lying down, etc.

Sherab Dorje said:

So please explain to me how the "remaining" bit is not about a type of mental focus. Albeit a loose rather than tight focus. Realistically though even "classical" samatha becomes effortless after a certain degree of familiarisation (like remaining in the natural state), so... I am having problems discerning the difference.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no focus. If you are focused, you are not resting in the nature of the mind, but rather, bound by a thought.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We are talking about clairvoyance, manomāyakāyas and so on. What is material about that?

Sherab Dorje said:

Nothing. But, that said, if a person IS clairvoyant then they should be able to read other peoples minds in a controlled experimental situation. Shouldn't they? Psychology (the Behavioural Sciences I studied) were quite adamant about using scientific (experimental) method to examine mental phenomena/processes (object recognition, for example), so theoretically...

I could easily think of a range of experiments that could be used to test telepathic ability.

Malcolm wrote:

Anyone who had such abilities would know what you were thinking and avoid you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The śamatha and vipaśyāna discussed in Mahāmudra and Dzogchen is completely different than the śamatha and vipaśyāna discussed in sūtra, which is what we are discussing. The former is based on introduction, the latter is not.

Sherab Dorje said:

And this will effect the ends how exactly?

Malcolm wrote:

Śamatha in Mahāmudra/Dzogchen is not based on mental one-pointedness, it is based on recognizing and remaining in the nature of the mind pointed out during introduction. It is also vipaśyāna. It also does not matter whether you are seated, standing, lying down, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 2:24 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Are you saying that sadhanas etc... do not lead to dhyana?

Malcolm wrote:

They do not. They do many things, but the cultivation of dhyāna is not among them.

Sherab Dorje said:

Without stabilization following insight the memory of the experience (which is all that remains) can easily become an object of attachment.

Malcolm wrote:

Then it is not seeing the truth.

Sherab Dorje said:

Impossible not to form karma if you are an ordinary person.

Of course. But there is such a thing as positive karma. Dana (for example) gives rise to positive karma vipakka, yes? So why can't mental absorption also give rise to positive outcomes?

Malcolm wrote:

Rebirth in samsara is never positive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Vasana said:

Lesser capacity encompasses those who need to practice shine ,lhagtong + see their non duality etc

Malcolm wrote:

The śamatha and vipaśyāna discussed in Mahāmudra and Dzogchen is completely different than the śamatha and vipaśyāna discussed in sūtra, which is what we are discussing. The former is based on introduction, the latter is not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Vasana said:

We still have the 2 obscurations and 'tranquility subdues them while insight uproots them.'

Malcolm wrote:

This applies only to the afflictive obscuration, not the knowledge obscuration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

We are still talking about dhyana my friend!

Malcolm wrote:

Not when we start talking about sadhanas, etc.

Sherab Dorje said:

By dhyana practices you are talking specifically about classic sati practices (for example)?

Malcolm wrote:

Specifically I am talking about the four dhyānas.

Sherab Dorje said:

There is no doubt about that. But I have met people that were lead astray by the bliss arising around insight too, so...

Malcolm wrote:

That was not authentic insight.

Sherab Dorje said:

At the same time, if attachment is not formed, couldn't they be taken as mental traces that help foster realisation since they will compel us to seek out instruction in a future lifetime?

Malcolm wrote:

Impossible not to form karma if you are an ordinary person.

Sherab Dorje said:

And I am asking/saying: What if there is no attachment? Why would they then necessarily be the seeds for future samsaric rebirth?

Malcolm wrote:

I have never met an ordinary person who was free of attachment to anything at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Astus said:

The materialist approach is to interpret the powers in a way that they should exist in a materially effective way, just like you seem to say. And that's why it is easily refuted as false by others with a similar materialistic approach.

Malcolm wrote:

We are talking about clairvoyance, manomāyakāyas and so on. What is material about that?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

This is where I fail to see why on-pointed meditation is mental-proliferation.

Malcolm wrote:

The first of the four yoga is one-pointedness. The second is freedom from proliferation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Astus said:

I don't recall the Buddha advising his disciples to use clairvoyance for anything.

Malcolm wrote:

Bodhisattvas are supposed to cultivate the five abijñas to be of benefit to other sentient beings. For example, being able to know the minds of other sentient beings means that one will automatically know what kind of teaching for which they are suited, etc.

Buddha gave much advice of this kind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I mean someone who is either a stream entrant or a first stage bodhisattva.

Sherab Dorje said:

So in order for one to "advance" in meditational practice one has to be "advanced" in meditational practice. Interesting theory. When you cultivate dhyānas as a normal person, not an ārya, you are doing nothing more nor less than cultivating samsaric paths for rebirth.

If one is not attached to dhyana, then why would this necessarily lead to the cultivation of samsaric paths?

In which case, and please correct me if I am wrong, are you saying that we have to give up meditation practices (and here I include sadhana, mantra, Yidam, etc... all of which are meditation practices) and devote ourselves to Dana while waiting for stream entry to spontaneously manifest?

Malcolm wrote:

You are now changing the scope of the discussion. I was focused specifically on dhyāna.

The practices you describe are bhavana (sgom pa) practices, not specifically the cultivation (sgom) of dhyāna.

Because the pleasures of dhyāna are quite intense, there is a great danger of being distracted by them if one is an ordinary person. And they do create traces for rebirth in the form realms which need to be eradicated later, because their very cultivation is a form of karma. In fact, the main reason why the Buddha went through the eight dhyānas was to eradicate traces he created through meditating them previously. And of course, bliss, clarity and nonconceptuality themselves place one at risk for taking rebirth in one of the three realms, depending upon which one there is attachment for, which is why in Mahāmudra there are extensive remedies for attachment to these three experiences

which result in rebirth in the three realms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Tell that to a Theravadin.

Malcolm wrote:

They would be the first to point that out.

Mkoll said:

It depends on who you ask. Passages in support of jhana being required can be found at AN 9.36 or MN 64 for example, and passages against in the commentaries or AN 4.170 for example. And respected teachers and masters have different views on the question.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course. However, there are also other ways the Buddha describes to become an ārya, for example, mindfulness of breathing combined with the four foundations of mindfulness, described famously as the ekayāna, the quick vehicle.

As MN 64 points, differences are based on capacity. Review the Cousin's article on śamathayāna and vipassanayāna. It's instructive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Queequeg said:

Did you catch the quotation marks?

What we can do is make the conditions that make ripe beings come. Like putting out a bird feeder.

Malcolm wrote:

If you have those freedoms and endowments, then if you fail to follow Dharma, it is because of some internal obscuration.

Queequeg said:

It's the old fate/free will question. Unsolvable. One of the conditions is that the Dharma endures where you're born. It's the people before us that caused Dharma to endure and be available for us. Our practice to make it endure for others.

Malcolm wrote:

As long as we are under the control of karma, what free will we have is afflicted.

There are myriad world systems where there is Dharma. I am not so worried about this one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This isn't true at all.

Sherab Dorje said:

Really? So what are you claiming? That discursive mind and mental proliferation lead to insight?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. But then, neither does one-pointed meditation, which is just another type of mental proliferation.

Sherab Dorje said:

When you cultivate dhyānas as a normal person, not an ārya, you are doing nothing more nor less than cultivating samsaric paths for rebirth.

In what sense are you using the term "arya" here? Do you mean a vow holding monastic? An Arhat? A Bodhisattva on the path?

Malcolm wrote:

I mean someone who is either a stream entrant or a first stage bodhisattva.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

No school of Buddhism requires this. All that is required is seeing the truth (insight). Insight, without first calming the mind, is basically impossible. Too much noise.

Malcolm wrote:

This isn't true at all.

Sherab Dorje said:

For example, lay people are expected to practice primarily generosity, patience and diligence, along with wisdom...

You are talking about the Theravada tradition, yes?

Malcolm wrote:

No. Mahāyāna tradition

Sherab Dorje said:

Sitting meditation is useful for calming the mind, but not much beyond that.

My experience shows otherwise, for me a calm mind is the foundation upon which wisdom and insight are built.

Malcolm wrote:

When you cultivate dhyānas as a normal person, not an ārya, you are doing nothing more nor less than cultivating samsaric paths for rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The development of the dhyānas has no bearing on liberation.

Sherab Dorje said:

Tell that to a Theravadin.

Malcolm wrote:

They would be the first to point that out.

Sherab Dorje said:

But seriously, what you say means that meditation does not work. I don't know if you are aware of this but all schools of Buddhism require the practice of meditational absorption.

Malcolm wrote:

No school of Buddhism requires this. All that is required is seeing the truth (insight). If equipoise equalled seeing the truth, we would all be first stage bodhisattvas.

For example, lay people are expected to practice primarily generosity, patience and diligence, along with wisdom, while monks are expected to practice discipline and dhyāna, etc.

Sitting meditation is useful for calming the mind, but not much beyond that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Well, let's put it this way: If even attaining the first jhana is rare, then the implication is that we, as practitioners following the Buddha's path, are completely and utterly screwed. It means that, essentially, all we can do is attempt to practice ethical behaviour in the hope that we can gain rebirth that will allow us to start to approach liberation. It means that the teachings on the precious human birth are a scam. That this precious human rebirth is actually NOT a suitable vehicle for liberation, etc...

What it basically means is that the entire edifice of Buddhist institutions for study and practice are USELESS.

That the idea of liberation is just a front to keep us from killing and raping one another.

So far nothing has been offered by anyone to the contrary.

Malcolm wrote:

The development of the dhyānas has no bearing on liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Queequeg said:

Did you catch the quotation marks?

What we can do is make the conditions that make ripe beings come. Like putting out a bird feeder.

Malcolm wrote:

If you have those freedoms and endowments, then if you fail to follow Dharma, it is because of some internal obscuration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Astus said:

Further clarification of my approach on the matter.

If powers are taken to be real magic, they actually remain only a matter of stories, good for entertainment and nothing more. But if they are understood as meditation/religious experiences, they regain their relevance and become something that people can relate to, that they can truly use for something, etc. And people do experience them, as many practitioner can testify.

Sherab Dorje said:

Astus has a point. If they are the outcome of meditational absorption then theoretically they are achievable by all meditation practitioners. Otherwise they are just mythological accounts with which to impress the credulous.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they are achievable by anyone with sufficient mastery of equipoise, from which they will naturally arise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Astus said:

Further clarification of my approach on the matter.

If powers are taken to be real magic, they actually remain only a matter of stories, good for entertainment and nothing more. But if they are understood as meditation/religious experiences, they regain their relevance and become something that people can relate to, that they can truly use for something, etc. And people do experience them, as many practitioner can testify.

Malcolm wrote:

Your approach to the subject is no different than any other scientific materialist.

What can you use clairvoyance for if it is not a real capacity of the human mind?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 24th, 2016 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Queequeg said:

I'm not really this cynical and misanthropic IRL.

We have to fix this because we have no choice. I am an "evangelical" Buddhist because I believe that propagation of Dharma is the best hope of fixing this and equipping our descendants with the tools to overcome the obstacles they will face.

Malcolm wrote:

You can't propagate Dharma evangelically. People only come to Dharma if they have a precious human birth with eighteen qualities of freedom and endowment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 23rd, 2016 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: New Book by Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche: The Guru Drinks Bourbon? (Nov 2016)

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

That is, a society where there are checks and prerequisites regarding somebody being, or claiming to be, a teacher.

Malcolm wrote:

In religion, there are little in the way of checks and balances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 23rd, 2016 at 9:35 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Dan74 said:

What would it do if someone on the internet said that it was not rare? It's much like any sort of attainment, impossible to prove.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is very easy to prove. When you have the first dhyāna, you are able to remain in one pointed concentration for a specified period of time, for example, one week, without moving. If you claim to have mastered the first dhyāna, then you should be able to demonstrate such feats easily.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 23rd, 2016 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The first one means that you can stay in meditation for as long as you like without physical discomfort. As I said, first dhyāna is pretty rare.

Sherab Dorje said:

You mean it assists remaining in meditation... because as long as there is discursive thought (albeit directed), one will exit meditation.

Malcolm wrote:

It means that these four or five factors are what distinguish the first dhyāna. It is assumed that you are in one-pointed concentration. But if you cannot sit still, you cannot focus one-pointedly, and when you can no longer sit still, you can no longer maintain one pointed concentration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 23rd, 2016 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: Is meditational absorption (jhana, dhyana) possible or not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

It was stated <http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=77&t=22234&start=80#p334893> (and in other threads) by Loppon Malcolm that:

Malcolm wrote:

There are very few people who have attained even the first dhyāna, let alone the fourth, in this day and age.

Sherab Dorje said:

I figure this is a pretty significant statement to make and, if it is true, seems to have many severe implications.

Personally I think that the characteristics of the first jhana: "...rapture and pleasure born from withdrawal, accompanied by directed thought and evaluation." are qualities that any earnest meditational practitioner can recognise from their practice.

So, is the claim unfounded or unrealistic or untrue?

Malcolm wrote:

These are not characteristics, these are specific mental factors: physical ease, mental joy, one-pointedness, initial attention and sustained attention.

The first one means that you can stay in meditation for as long as you like without physical discomfort. As I said, first dhyāna is pretty rare.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 23rd, 2016 at 8:59 PM

Title: Re: New Book by Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche: The Guru Drinks Bourbon? (Nov 2016)

Content:

Zla'od said:

Ethical complaints should not be hand-waved away with quasi-magical claims.

Malcolm wrote:

Educate yourself as to how a guru is supposed to behave. If you pick the wrong one, you've only yourself to blame, i.e., caveat emptor.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 23rd, 2016 at 5:22 AM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:
Malcolm wrote:
These days? Tibet and India.

Astus said:
it seems very unlikely that if there are people with genuine supernormal powers, they just remain unnoticed.

Malcolm wrote:
Frankly, they prefer to remain unnoticed. And, imagine how annoying it would be to be able to "hear" all the chatter in other beings' minds. What a cacophony.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, April 23rd, 2016 at 5:17 AM
Title: Re: Vajra Guru Mantra Origin / Sanskrit Questions
Content:

Sherab Dorje said:
I imagine it was first recorded by Yeshe Tsogyal. Karma Lingpa then found it in the 14th Century.

quad said:
Right. I was not disputing Yeshe Tsogyal as the original author of the commentary, I was just asking if this was the first text the mantra was recorded in. The commentary doesn't specify if it's a new mantra, just expands on it's purpose and benefits. For all I know the mantra was being used before the 14th century, and this text is just further teaching on the practice. If you're answering with knowledge that it is indeed the first written appearance of the mantra, then thank you.

My first question though was really just a lead-in to how the mantra was written in it's original text, as PADMA or PÄDMA?

Malcolm wrote:
It is a guru name mantra. It is likely it goes back to the late 8th century. We have clear evidence for it by the 13th century in the works of Guru Chowang. It probably existed in Nyang Ral's termas as well.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, April 23rd, 2016 at 5:05 AM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016
Content:

Inge said:
What kind of ecological collapse do you think awaits us?
And when do you believe this is going to happen?

Malcolm wrote:

A total breakdown of planetary weather patterns, etc., the result of human overuse of resources, habitat destruction, mass extinctions, the acidification of the oceans.

It is happening now, all around us. We surrounded by it as we speak.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 23rd, 2016 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

It's not as rare as you think.

Astus said:

If it were only a matter of gaining the fourth level of absorption - something that's not exclusive to Buddhists - magical feats would be as common as marathon runners, or at least as world class athletes.

Malcolm wrote:

There are very few people who have attained even the first dhyāna, let alone the fourth, in this day and age.

Of course, since you don't know any real yogis, you have never encountered people who have these capacities.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 23rd, 2016 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Astus said:

If that's so straightforward as you say, where are all the telepathic and miracle making yogis (besides all the stories)?

Malcolm wrote:

These days? Tibet and India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2016 at 11:08 PM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Astus said:

Again, this does not actually explain how it is possible, or how it works, it just says that it happens so. So, "samadhi" is an insufficient reason. Unless what you mean is that we can have such experiences of the powers during meditation, but it should not be taken literally.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it explains both how it is possible and how it works. When you are less distracted by your own thoughts, you can perceive the thoughts of others more easily. A mind is both unimpeded and unimpeding by nature. It should be taken literally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2016 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Astus said:

OK. Still, what is the cause/condition/reason for being able to do so? You said that "It is a very simple principle that does not require much analysis." - that is practically like saying that "it just happens".

Malcolm wrote:

Samadhi is the cause and condition of being able to perceive the thoughts in the mind of another.

Losal Samten said:

Is this a meditational samadhi or the caitasika samadhi of a regular mind?

Malcolm wrote:

Dhyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2016 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The three realms are not just a production of solely our own traces

Astus said:

Then the triple realm is not just a mental construct. It sounds like you say the world is a virtual/mental reality of many minds.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is how reality is described in the Mahāyānasamgraha, among other texts.

Astus said:

Subject a has a thought that Subject b perceives.

OK. Still, what is the cause/condition/reason for being able to do so? You said that "It is a very simple principle that does not require much analysis." - that is practically like saying that "it just happens".

Malcolm wrote:

Samadhi is the cause and condition of being able to perceive the thoughts in the mind of another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2016 at 8:43 PM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Astus said:

When and how do we perceive others' minds? Since the triple realm is a production of one's own delusions, even mountains are just the false projections of concepts. How could traces (what are such traces anyway?) of minds then come from others?

Malcolm wrote:

The three realms are not just a production of solely our own traces, as the example the women who meditated herself as a tiger frightening her fellow villagers with a tiger shows, or the example of manomāyakāyas which are perceptible to others also shows. Other sentient beings traces are strong enough to generate appearances for our own minds as well.

Astus said:

You seem to fail to grasp generic sameness as opposed to sameness as identity. If I apprehend someone else's direct perception of a blue vase, my perception and theirs are generically the same, but the sameness of identity.

What specific details would be different in a single moment of thought?

Malcolm wrote:

You are barking up the wrong tree. Subject a has a thought that Subject b perceives.

Astus said:

Then there is the funny case of the group of arhats who all shared one mind, in the sense that since they were completely open to one another, it appeared to them as if

they had but a single mind.
Just out of curiosity, where is that story found?

Malcolm wrote:
[/quote]

Good question, I saw it here or on E-Sangha, maybe Anders was the one who introduced it.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2016 at 8:16 PM
Title: Re: New Book by Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche: The Guru Drinks Bourbon (Nov 2016)
Content:
Zla'od said:
Meanwhile, the name of Dzongsar's organization, "Siddhartha's Intent," suggests a similar back-to-basics approach...

Malcolm wrote:
It's a reference to the title of a book by Sakya Pandita, which is indeed a call for a back to basics approach.

Zla'od said:
Dzongsar for his part grew up with family connections to prominent lamas who tended to recognize one another's children as tulkus, and accept teachers from one another's families, as a means of perpetuating their family's charisma as religious professionals.

Malcolm wrote:
I am sure that they were not that interested in perpetuating their families charisma as religious professionals. It is not a very fun job.

Zla'od said:
An acquaintance of mine who complained to Dzongsar about the predations of Sogyal Rinpoche, was told to keep quiet.

Malcolm wrote:
Unless Sogyal is guilty of a crime, by which I mean, he is convicted of sexual harassment or worse, there is really nothing to say about his morays and habits with (consenting) adults.

Zla'od said:
And of course Dzongsar praises Trungpa and maintains close ties to the Trungpa organizations.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a lot to praise. But what you really fail to understand is that these folks (Trungpa, Dzongsar, Sogyal, etc.) are all students of Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche. They are a vajra family and of course they are going to stick together.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2016 at 8:08 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nah, we are f%^ing doomed.

treehuggingoctopus said:

I am convinced we are in for a nightmare ride. I do not think it is absolutely certain we are bound for new dark ages.

Kim O'Hara said:

Climate scientist Kevin Anderson is on the same page, having been quoted as saying, "I don't think we are going to succeed, but I don't know we are going to fail."

Malcolm wrote:

You guys are kidding yourselves. Our present civilization will not withstand the full fledged ecological collapse of the kind we face.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2016 at 8:03 PM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

rory said:

For Tibetan Buddhism and followers of Yogacara that is the case (I assume from your quote) but the revolutionary point of the Lotus Sutra is that

the Dragon girl isn't a human, she is a serpent

Malcolm wrote:

Not that revolutionary. The Goddess of the Ganges isn't a human, she is a devī.

rory said:

The point being made by Zhiyi that anything with buddhanature - women, animals, etc can become immediately enlightened, the onerous systems of rebirth is rendered unnecessary. Very revolutionary...

Malcolm wrote:

I wouldn't call this revolutionary.

rory said:

this idea was taken up and extended to enlightenment of non-sentient beings: eg grasses and trees- Ch: caomu chengfo; JP: sokomu jobutsu. An idea much celebrated in Japanese art and literature..

Malcolm wrote:

I am not sure that we can consider any living thing nonsentient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2016 at 7:53 PM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Minds are essentially unimpeded and nonimpeding so the question of how they connect is irrelevant. It's the wrong question.

Astus said:

Since we generally don't perceive others' minds, there is something impeding that perception, or there is a lack of condition for perception. What is it?

Malcolm wrote:

Who says we don't perceive others minds. We just don't know that the appearance of the triple realm is a mentally generated appearance. The traces of other minds are of enough strength even to create appearances for ourselves.

Astus said:

Also, if there is no separation between minds, they still remain separate continua, i.e. different causal sequences. If two continua could result in the same moment of consciousness, that would mean two sequences becoming one, and from then on they could not go on different sequences, unless we assume that from a single moment of consciousness two different moments could occur.

Malcolm wrote:

You seem to fail to grasp generic sameness as opposed to sameness as identity. If I apprehend someone else's direct perception of a blue vase, my perception and theirs are generically the same, but the sameness of identity.

Then there is the funny case of the group of arhats who all shared one mind, in the sense that since they were completely open to one another, it appeared to them as if

they had but a single mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2016 at 9:31 AM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

1. Direct perceptions are nonconceptual, there is no concept of "blue" when a blue object, for example, a blue vase, is initially perceived.

2. Your mind becomes an object for other minds because of the characteristics you grasp. It is a very simple principle that does not require much analysis. Whether or not a person other than you apprehending your thoughts has grasping to them as well is irrelevant. Minds are essentially unimpeded and nonimpeding so the question of how they connect is irrelevant. It's the wrong question.

For example, the blueness of a vase.

Astus said:

OK, that's a concept, a function of perception (samjna).

Upon what should a mind depend? If you assert it must continue based on sense perceptions, then you cannot explain how a mind continues in a completely nonconceptual samadhi, for example, nirvikalpa samadhi (which in a Buddha is called Vajropama Samadhi).

When there is nothing grasped, there is no grasper either. But that means only the lack of substantialisation of object and subject, not that there are no phenomena.

Same only in the sense in the sense that two fires are both hot; different in so far as the two fires are distinct. In other words, I apprehend the ball in your mind's eye, the image I perceive in my mind will be identical to how you perceive the ball, but different in so far as our minds are distinct continuums.

Mind is the subjective experience. To make it an object is not any more a subjective experience, therefore not the experience of another's mind, but a concept about what is in another's mind. In other words, you can think that I think about a ball. That happens even when I tell you that I think of a ball, so you know what I think about. Telepathy is knowing what I think without I telling you. But since there is no connection between the minds, what is the cause of knowing it? Without connection it is like seeing a ball that's in another room - there is no light reaching the eyes from the ball, so it cannot be seen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2016 at 4:02 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

If we are very, very lucky, capitalism will end before the direst consequences of the currently unfolding global ecological catastrophe manifest...

Malcolm wrote:

Nah, we are f&^%ing doomed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2016 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Intoxicants - what is, what isn't?

Content:

MindTheGap said:

Thanks, Ayu I guess smoking, through the process of being overcome, leads to personal growth. That's a good way to look at it.

Malcolm wrote:

Tobacco takes up a radioactive isotope, polonium 210. This is why the tar from tobacco etc. gives you cancer, and marijuana does not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2016 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: How can we know if Karma has matured/ripened?

Content:

Mother's Lap said:

...thus invalidating Meru abhidharmic cosmology completely.

Malcolm wrote:

Not a problem.

Mother's Lap said:

Our sky is blue because we face the sapphire side of Meru
dontyouknowthankyouverymuch!

Malcolm wrote:

It is a nice idea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 22nd, 2016 at 12:04 AM

Title: Re: How can we know if Karma has matured/ripened?

Content:

Mother's Lap said:

We're on Jambudvipa...

Malcolm wrote:

Not really. Jambudvipa is India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2016 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

there is such a thing as a mind that does not apprehend characteristics, hence a mind without characteristics.

Astus said:

What counts as characteristic?

Malcolm wrote:

For example, the blueness of a vase.

Astus said:

What does a mind without characteristics depend on?

Malcolm wrote:

Upon what should a mind depend? If you assert it must continue based on sense perceptions, then you cannot explain how a mind continues in a completely nonconceptual samadhi, for example, nirvikalpa samadhi (which in a Buddha is called Vajropama Samadhi).

Astus said:

There are a number of differences between a ball and a mind. What makes a consciousness is a moment of cognition. If one has the very same moment of cognition, then it is the same mind.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Same only in the sense in the sense that two fires are both hot; different in so far as the two fires are distinct. In other words, I apprehend the ball in your mind's eye, the image I perceive in my mind will be identical to how you perceive the ball, but different in so far as our minds are distinct continuums.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2016 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But it clearly does, since it is described as such in many sūtras, etc.

Astus said:

A mind without characteristics exists? That would be an independent consciousness, a soul.

Malcolm wrote:

You mistake my meaning — there is such a thing as a mind that does not apprehend characteristics, hence a mind without characteristics.

Astus said:

Yes, consciousness is of something, of characteristics. Saying that telepathy is seeing the characteristics is equal to seeing the mind, just as there is no roundness and ball separately, therefore experiencing the same characteristic as another is being one with the other, a merging of minds.

Malcolm wrote:

No, no more than seeing a ball is merging with a ball.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2016 at 9:21 PM

Title: Re: How can we know if Karma has matured/ripened?

Content:

kdolma said:

How long does one have before Karma is ripened or matured, that one has to face the consequences?

I haven't found any clear sources about the ripening of Karma...

1. When it ripens?
2. How it ripens?
3. How long one has when doing purifying practices before it matures? if it's too late?
4. How it all comes together to ripen?

Malcolm wrote:

Look in the Abhidharmakosha, part four.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2016 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Jeff H said:

I'm surprised no one has responded to this article. It's pretty long, so maybe no one read it. But she seems to back up her case against Bernie (and for Hilary) with competent research and sound logic.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a hit piece, and virtually everything she says is unfounded or spinned.

Jeff H said:

Yes, it reads like a hit piece, but that's why I was expecting someone who knows better might rebut some of her major points.

Malcolm wrote:

It is too long to make it worthwhile. Let's just put it this way, the Clinton Campaign now supports the Citizen's United contention that one cannot make a link between donations and influence, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2016 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: New Book by Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche: The Guru Drinks Bourbon (Nov 2016)

Content:

Zla'od said:

One of my professors observed that a traditional Tibetan response to somebody like Trungpa would have been to chase him over to the next valley!

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think so. He was a tertön.

Zla'od said:

As for the tulku "system," it is no system at all, but a family of related institutions / de facto family businesses / charismatic upstarts, some of which enter into alliances with one another. Dzongsar is very much a product of this milieu.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, how could it be otherwise?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2016 at 8:56 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

LunaRoja said:

I thought this article raised some very good points...

<https://medium.com/@robinalperstein/on-becoming-anti-bernie->

ee87943ae699#.o1z4pylpx

Jeff H said:

I'm surprised no one has responded to this article. It's pretty long, so maybe no one read it. But she seems to back up her case against Bernie (and for Hilary) with competent research and sound logic.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a hit piece, and virtually everything she says is unfounded or spinned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2016 at 8:39 PM

Title: Re: New Book by Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche: The Guru Drinks Bourbon (Nov 2016)

Content:

Zla'od said:

If Tibetan lamas were Christian evangelists, then Mr. Dzongsar would be Rob Bell. He's selling a certain image of himself. He wants us to think of him as something of an iconoclast, but at the end of the day, he's very much a member of the guild.

Come now, is over-judgementalism of gurus really the biggest problem facing Tibetan Buddhism today? I would argue that we have the opposite problem--we don't hold them (and they don't hold each other) to a high enough ethical standard. (No, I'm not talking about alcohol here.)

Malcolm wrote:

It is the job of a prospective student to hold a guru to an ethical standard. There is no governing body which deems who is fit and who is unfit to serve as a guru, though the tulku system would hold that place if it were effective at recognizing tulkus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2016 at 8:37 PM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Astus, indeed minds do not enter each other. However, in knowing the mind of another, what is required is that the mind to be known apprehends characteristics. If it does not apprehend characteristics, there is nothing for another to apprehend about that mind—for example, when some devas became unnerved when they could not locate a favored monk, they were informed that he was a) now an arhat b) in equipoise, which is why they were unable to find him with their minds.

Astus said:

That is the idea that

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?p=334111&sid=744a1659a6aff7331c07d0a6f5>

92d7c9#p334111 analysed in his writing, and criticised it.

As for minds with characteristics, if we say that consciousness necessarily has an object - one is always conscious of something, not just conscious - then a mind without characteristics does not exist.

Malcolm wrote:

But it clearly does, since it is described as such in many sūtras, etc.

Also, realized people (bodhisattvas, arhats) with liberated minds may indeed cognize characteristics when in post-euipoise. All the examples you gave merely demonstrate that point. Further, sound is apprehended by characteristics, etc. All cognitions are cognitions via characteristics from which we conceptually abstract our world.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2016 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

in the deceptively appearing bodies of sentient beings.

Yes so? It means that the deceptively appearing bodies of sentient beings have sugatagarbha, it does not mean that there are no sentient beings nor that they have no bodies, as Vimalamitra points out when defining a sems can, a sentient being:

Since the mind [sems] is adulterated with concepts within the body (an aggregate of assembled elements), the mind is dependent on the body. Thus the possessive particle "can" is used.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2016 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

Any question of beings is bound to be dualistic.

Malcolm wrote:

Not from the point of view of Buddhanature.

maybay said:

From the point of view of Buddhanature there is no question of beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahaha, than how do you explain this passage from the Inlaid Jewels Tantra:

Just as oil has always been naturally perfect

within sesame seeds and mustard seeds,

the seed of the sugatas

with corresponding light is present
in the deceptively appearing bodies of sentient beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2016 at 4:13 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

Any question of beings is bound to be dualistic.

Malcolm wrote:

Not from the point of view of Buddhanature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2016 at 3:53 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

For my part I'm addicted to learning. I don't know how to stop reading news, and Twitter and all these things. And I think, call me conceited, but if I can't restrain myself from the nonsense I've been so carefully and purposefully introduced to, how in the world is a third-world refugee going to have the strength of mind to resist the pandora's box of corrupting influences that lie waiting for them on the other side of basic literacy?

Malcolm wrote:

You have not defined "purity," so what are to understand by your invocation of "corruption?"

maybay said:

Purity might be what those traditional Indian have, and those educated Indian woman have lost, which causes them to lose the will to live.

Malcolm wrote:

Which traditional Indians? Pre-Gupta? Post-Gupta? Pre-Mughal? Post-Mughal? Pre-Victorian? Post-Victorian? Which ones have lost the will to live?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2016 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

Dan74 said:

What's the argument here actually about?

maybay said:

A few things. Some people think that beings are all equal...

Malcolm wrote:

They are all equal.

maybay said:

even though the realms of samsara clearly differentiate levels of suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

That's not a function of innate equality, that is a function of circumstances.

maybay said:

Some also think inequality is unknown to Bodhisattvas, who are graded in one of ten levels.

Malcolm wrote:

All bodhisattvas on the stages have the same realization. The bhumis measure qualities, not realization.

maybay said:

They also think that if two composite aggregations share a common element then they must be labelled equal.

Malcolm wrote:

Tathāgatrāgarbha pervades all sentient beings. This alone is a reason to consider all sentient beings equal.

maybay said:

And probably most distressing is the idea that if anyone is considered low, that entitles those who are high to abuse them.

Malcolm wrote:

Dualistic much?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2016 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Saoshun said:

US will fall anyway, there is no way that US can recover from debt.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it can.

Saoshun said:

Yes, by starting a war, the same as Hitler did.

Malcolm wrote:

No, a great deal of that debt has already been paid down. Keep in mind, it is not the US economy that will be upset by a US default. If the Republicans get in, you can be sure that there will a) be another war b) that US debt will again grow.

But the debt is not really a problem, people imagine that it is because it sounds "bad." But that is a silly judgement which stems from not understanding how the economy works and how money is created (i.e. through lending).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 21st, 2016 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: can one mind enter another?

Content:

Astus said:

What is the explanation of the movement of thoughts between beings?

Malcolm wrote:

Astus, indeed minds do not enter each other. However, in knowing the mind of another, what is required is that the mind to be known apprehends characteristics. If it does not apprehend characteristics, there is nothing for another to apprehend about that mind—for example, when some devas became unnerved when they could not locate a favored monk, they were informed that he was a) now an arhat b) in equipoise, which is why they were unable to find him with their minds.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2016 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: New Book by Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche: The Guru Drinks Bourbon (Nov 2016)

Content:

Zla'od said:

I don't hold liquor against him, but in view of the wider Buddhist ethos (not to mention the Trungpa fiasco) this is in questionable taste. Is his point that tantra means incorporating samsaric delights into the path, like those famous peacocks in the poison grove? Or that we ought not to judge one another (or our gurus) according to normal, possibly dualistic / conceptual standards of spiritual propriety, lest we accidentally condemn Drukpa Kinlay? Is the consumption of intoxicants fundamentally different from the actions-to-avoid of the other precepts? Surely no one would produce a book like this, but about shoplifting, or slaughtering chickens.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a question mark in the title: The Guru Drinks Bourbon?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2016 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

For my part I'm addicted to learning. I don't know how to stop reading news, and Twitter and all these things. And I think, call me conceited, but if I can't restrain myself from the nonsense I've been so carefully and purposefully introduced to, how in the world is a third-world refugee going to have the strength of mind to resist the pandora's box of corrupting influences that lie waiting for them on the other side of basic literacy?

Malcolm wrote:

You have not defined "purity," so what are to understand by your invocation of "corruption?"

maybay said:

But it has nothing to do with Dharma, and if it falls within the four means of attraction, I'm still waiting to hear where you would place it.

Malcolm wrote:

You forget that the gift of writing implements is included within those four means, specifically within dāna, as is conferring fearlessness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2016 at 6:44 PM

Title: Re: Rebirth

Content:

Daizan said:

Why not see it as a thing?

Malcolm wrote:

Because then it would be seen as a self.

Daizan said:

You say it's not a thing to avoid seeing it as a self. That doesn't mean it's not a thing.

Malcolm wrote:

If the self were a thing, it would have something by which it could be identified. The five aggregates are things, the self is not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2016 at 6:54 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

Most educated people are tame.

Malcolm wrote:

The purpose of Buddhadharma is to tame sentient beings. It is a form of education. But before people can understand Buddhadharma, they also must have certain prerequisites, and standard literacy is among those requirements.

Sohei said:

The purpose of Buddhadharma is to liberate sentient beings. It is an education to that end, and literacy is not necessarily a requisite.

Malcolm wrote:

There have been different kinds of literacy throughout history. Being trained in an oral culture is a kind of literacy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 20th, 2016 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Saoshun said:

US will fall anyway, there is no way that US can recover from debt.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it can.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2016 at 10:32 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

Most educated people are tame.

Malcolm wrote:

The purpose of Buddhadharma is to tame sentient beings. It is a form of education. But before people can understand Buddhadharma, they also must have certain prerequisites, and standard literacy is among those requirements.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2016 at 9:58 PM

Title: Re: Rebirth

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What continues, in essence, is a mistaken idea about reality, which has no beginning and reproduces itself

Daizan wrote:

Why not see it as a thing?

Because then it would be seen as a self.

Kunga Lhadzom said:

But you yourself called it : it self

It's hard not to use concepts, when trying to describe the indescribable.....but I think by saying that it "reproduces itself" is a good description

Malcolm wrote:

This is not an issue of describing the indescribable. Conventionally we use pronouns such as I, me, mine, myself, etc. But nothing real is described by them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2016 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It was clear to me. YMMV.

Queequeg said:

You're also extraordinarily tuned in. Yep, mileage for people who aren't following every single twist and turn in this drama is considerably different than yours.

Bernie aint running for Buddha.

I prefer my candidates avoid, as much as possible, the ten nonvirtues. I would have thought this was a no-brainer. If you condone someone acting non-virtuously, than you also accrues the same karma x the number of people who condone it.

I prefer my candidates to hammer an advantageous truth at every opportunity. BTW, if you're telling the truth, that's not calumny.

Dial it back a notch, dude.

Malcolm wrote:

The campaign is already vituperative enough without encouraging more of it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2016 at 8:51 PM

Title: Re: Rebirth

Content:

Daizan said:

Why not see it as a thing?

Malcolm wrote:

Because then it would be seen as a self.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2016 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Not really. Bernie voted for it while predicting at the same time it would have the undesirable consequence of making sentencing harsher, but it contained the violence against woman act, so he had to vote for it.

Queequeg said:

He voted for it with reservations. ie. he voted for it. Put a footnote on the sentences of every poor sap who got sentenced under the law. I guess that diminishes the sting a little?

Malcolm wrote:

He voted for it because it contained an important amendment, the Violence Against Women act. That was the only reason he voted for it. He would have voted against it, except that it contained a billion dollars of funding for that VAW act.

Queequeg said:

Bernie referred to it by declaring it was a racist thing to do, but he failed to emphasize what was racist.

He said the term was racist.

It wasn't clear what he was referring to. He assumed everyone knew the real point of the question was the "super predator" comment. On second thought, he didn't bunt, he whiffed.

Malcolm wrote:

It was clear to me. YMMV.

Queequeg said:

This is calumny, one of the ten nonvirtues.

Bernie aint running for Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

I prefer my candidates avoid, as much as possible, the ten nonvirtues. I would have thought this was a no-brainer. If you condone someone acting non-virtuously, than you also accrues the same karma x the number of people who condone it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2016 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

Well what do you mean by opportunity?

Malcolm wrote:

Access to education.

maybay said:

This is a euphemism. You know there's no place on earth where education as possibility doesn't become education as a necessity for everyone.

The problem is it's like introducing an alien species into another land. Because whatever. It's compassionate. But then this new species goes berserk, so you've also got to bring over the bug that typically keeps it under control. So you do that, but then that bug starts eating other things. Before you know it you've knocked a delicate ecosystem into a wobble, which now depends on you each day to keep it from falling over.

Malcolm wrote:

So now education is a pestilence? You have a very strange view of the world.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2016 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

Sohei said:

However, I think women should not ever be drafted. Military standards should not be lowered to allow women.

Malcolm wrote:

Lowered? Tell that to the women fighters in the PKK. They will swiftly hand your ass to you.

Sohei said:

Professional and educational quotas for women should have a terminus.

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, you are a troll.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2016 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: Dunning-Kruger Effect

Content:

Daizan said:

Dawkins is a gene-centred view where it follows that the more two individuals are genetically related, the more sense (at the level of the genes) it makes for them to behave selflessly with each other. This is significant in regard to human behavior.

Malcolm wrote:

Doesn't work out too well for various kinds of spiders and fish...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2016 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth

Content:

Daizan said:

I wish it, thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

Just as long as we are clear it is not a thing which moves from one life to another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2016 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Queequeg said:

In the part of the debate that I watched, the crime bill that Bill Clinton signed into law was brought up, which is now controversial because it led to a dramatic increase in incarceration, particularly, African Americans. Bernie supported the bill also, so, as for support, its a wash; they both are guilty of making sentencing much harsher.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really. Bernie voted for it while predicting at the same time it would have the undesirable consequence of making sentencing harsher, but it contained the violence against woman act, so he had to vote for it.

Queequeg said:

Bernie referred to it by declaring it was a racist thing to do, but he failed to emphasize what was racist.

Malcolm wrote:

He said the term was racist.

Queequeg said:

In politics, you gotta throttle your opponent at every opportunity, make them look like the crooked noses they are!

Malcolm wrote:

This is calumny, one of the ten nonvirtues.

Queequeg said:

When asked about how Hilary has been in the pocket of the banks, he couldn't come up with anything.

Malcolm wrote:

Speeches, Speeches, Speeches. How many times does he have to say it?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2016 at 2:13 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Queequeg said:

He doesn't seem to have it in him to turn the knife.

Malcolm wrote:

That is the job of voters.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 19th, 2016 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth

Content:

Daizan said:

"I habit" could be interpreted as a force.

So what might we call the force being transferred in rebirth?

Malcolm wrote:

No "force" transfers.

What continues, in essence, is a mistaken idea about reality, which has no beginning

and reproduces itself without end unless it meets with the path. If you wish to consider this a "force," ok.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2016 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Does (Tibetan) Buddhism fit in a Western archetypal sche

Content:

Adamantine said:

a really bizarre thing

Malcolm wrote:

Maybay seems fond of the bizarre.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2016 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Rebirth

Content:

Daizan said:

So what might we call the force being transferred in rebirth?

Malcolm wrote:

No "force" transfers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2016 at 6:54 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

I suppose you consider education a right.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course education is a right, as is healthcare, housing, and so on.

maybay said:

Nozick can pretty much kiss goodbye to his minimal state.

Malcolm wrote:

Did I ever say I was a follower of Nozick? Absolutely not. I admire his writing, I admire his thinking, I think he is excellent philosopher, but his "minimalist" state is a fantasy at best. States do not remain "minimal."

That said, a state's job is to guarantee rights, and since I am not a dead letter constitutionalist, I think it is quite alright that in the process of working things through we "discover," or rather uncover new rights, for example the education, healthcare, and

so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2016 at 6:07 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

I suppose you consider education a right.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course education is a right, as is healthcare, housing, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2016 at 6:04 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth

Content:

Daizan said:

The question is what's reborn, not "is what's reborn the same as what came before?"

Malcolm wrote:

"Rebirth" is a convention. AS Nāgṛjuna puts it:

Although the aggregates are serially connected,
the wise are to comprehend nothing transfers.

He comments on this:

In that respect, the aggregates are the aggregates of matter, sensation, perception, formations and consciousness. Termed 'serially joined', those having not ceased, produce another produced from that cause. Nevertheless, not even the subtle atom of an existent transmigrates from this world to the next.

He continues further:

One who has conceived of annihilation
even in extremely subtle existents,
is not wise and will never see
the meaning of "arisen from conditions."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2016 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

No two people are granted the same opportunities.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you mean by "opportunity."

maybay said:

Well what do you mean by opportunity?

Malcolm wrote:

Access to education.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2016 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth

Content:

Daizan said:

Bakmoon writes that there is a causal continuity between mental continuums, Bristrollad. What does this mental causal continuity consist of if not mental factors?

Bakmoon said:

By causal continuity I don't mean an underlying substrate of mental factors, but a cause and effect relationship between consciousness at one time and consciousness at another.

Daizan said:

Why wouldn't we conclude from this that consciousness is the thing that is reborn?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a consciousness identical with the previous moment of consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 18th, 2016 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

No two people are granted the same opportunities.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you mean by "opportunity."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 17th, 2016 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Rebirth

Content:

rachmiel said:

Aha. This is clarifying, thanks. I'm a big fan of process philosophy, and what you describe sounds very similar to (my take on) its take on processes.

How could I find out more about what Buddhism considers to be formless existences? This seems to be getting at the heart of the "what is reborn?" question.

Malcolm wrote:

The ultimate Madhyamaka point of view on this is that what take rebirth is a non-existent "I habit" which is the agent of action and which can experience retribution of action, but there is no actual entity which undergoes rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 17th, 2016 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

Sohei said:

Of course, it only reduces the birth rates for women who are disposed to being educated.

Malcolm wrote:

It reduces birth rates in women who are encouraged to go to school and given the opportunity to do so in a supportive environment.

Sohei said:

From the perspective of Emptiness, their deeds are neither good nor evil and their views are in perfect accord with the ultimate nature of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

This is an entirely specious statement.

Sohei said:

Frankly, whether it is they who are evil or you is more a matter of politics and applied violence than morality.

Malcolm wrote:

People like those who make up Boko Haram are deeply perverted sentient beings who are enemies of the Dharm, and would destroy it in a second if given the power and opportunity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 17th, 2016 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

Sohei said:

When people say that men and women are naturally equal and that inequality is an artificial or socially constructed condition, they are ignoring the fact that the amount of status conferred to individual human beings in a state of nature is determined by fixed (or relatively stable) characteristics related to survival.

Malcolm wrote:

State of nature? What does that mean?

Sohei said:

When we talk about social equality, what we're really talking about are social controls that can aid in intelligently harnessing our human energies towards forwarding the civilizational endeavor. However, thinking that these controls erase our differences - or forgetting that these differences exist - is foolish and even dangerous, in some cases.

Malcolm wrote:

"Equality" does not mean there are no differences among individuals. It simply means that everyone granted the same opportunities and recognized to have the same rights irrespective of their "race," gender, gender preference, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 17th, 2016 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In any case, the Goddess of the Ganges episode within the Vimalakirti Nirdeśa Sūtra is a much better example of the lack of importance of the role of gender in terms of ultimate awakening.

Queequeg said:

We can speculate about the original.

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing to speculate about. The Tibetan and Sanskrit versions are very clear. Please see Kern, Dover edition, 252-254. Not sure why you say that the Sanskrit manuscripts Kern had access to do not contain this tale. Also masculine and feminine endings are very precise in Sanskrit, so his translation is not mistaken [see Hurvitz also].

Queequeg said:

In any event I think you'd agree in light of the weight of misogyny in the Buddhist corpus, it's only good that we have versions that emphasize that gender is of little matter when it comes to attaining buddhahood.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think the Lotus Sūtra is a good example of this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 17th, 2016 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Queequeg said:

Actually, in East Asia, this is not how the passage is read.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps, but the way it reads in the original Sanskrit is that she transforms first into a male, and then proceeds to attain buddhahood.

Queequeg said:

Same in the Chinese. But this transformation is framed as an instantaneous transformation perceived through miraculous vision. The Naga girl remains in front of the Buddha before the assembly.

I was not aware of a Sanskrit source for this chapter. The Sanskrit Kern translated does not include this chapter.

We may have an instance of the translation improving the original.

Malcolm wrote:

This story is included in the Tibetan version, and it is not framed as a vision generated by the nāgā princess. In the Tibetan translation, she transforms herself into a boy, etc. Generally, Tibetan translations are much more faithful to the Indian text.

In any case, the Goddess of the Ganges episode with in the Vimalakirti Nirdeśa Sutra is a much better example of the lack of importance of the role of gender in terms of ultimate awakening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 16th, 2016 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Queequeg said:

Actually, in East Asia, this is not how the passage is read.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps, but the way it reads in the original Sanskrit is that she transforms first into a

male, and then proceeds to attain buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 16th, 2016 at 6:22 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Mother's Lap said:

Can females transition from the path of joining to the path of seeing in sutra?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 16th, 2016 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

DGA said:

There's all manner of misogynistic material in Mahayana texts. I haven't encountered any in Dzogchen material so far, but then again, I'm only able to read translations. (one reason why I'm thankful for translators.) Malcolm, can you think of any examples of misogynistic content in Dzogchen texts that can be discussed publicly? I reckon this may be better off in a separate thread, but here we are.

Malcolm wrote:

I have yet to find any either [in Dzogchen tantras].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 16th, 2016 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

Such as?

Malcolm wrote:

The Ratnavali would prove to be an instructive text for you to read for starters.

maybay said:

I pray that all women

Will be able to achieve rebirth as the most supreme men

And will constantly forever after

Be able to gain perfect fulfillment in the clarities and bases.

Oops...

Malcolm wrote:

Perfectly understandable given the impossibility of changing patriarchal India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 16th, 2016 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

Such as?

Malcolm wrote:

The Ratnavali would prove to be an instructive text for you to read for starters.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 16th, 2016 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

I should not be concerned with building a just society.

Malcolm wrote:

It is comforting to know that the Mahāyāna tradition does not share your social pessimism.

maybay said:

I am neither optimistic nor pessimistic about the workings of karma.

Malcolm wrote:

You are pretty pessimistic. You seem to think that worldly people are incapable of even temporary benefits in samsara. But we know this is not true. If it were true, there would be no reason to study the outer four sciences, and yet, we are encouraged to study them all and apply them. We also have many examples of social welfare programs recommended by Nāgārjuna, Padmasambhava, etc., to the leaders of their day.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 16th, 2016 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Saoshun said:

I think now of creating right wing buddhist movement. (but do not think of trump or something like that)

Malcolm wrote:

And how is Capitalism going to help anything? It is destroying the planet.

MiphamFan said:

Last year you were saying capitalism is still superior to communism. Do you take that back?

Malcolm wrote:

Communism, by which we mean, the USSR, etc. was a disaster, as is Marxism-Leninism in general. So yes, it is better than that. It does not however mean I am by any means pro-capitalist.

MiphamFan said:

He maintained that the sovereign state has a role to play in defence, justice and building of public works which benefit no specific party as well as education. Also he thought that monopolies and collusion of employers and bankers should be stopped even if it is in way an encroachment of their natural liberties, because they will harm society at large.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. But it is not sufficient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 16th, 2016 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

DGA said:

I'm glad you raised the question of social justice, maybay. I think that's the heart of the discussion here. What would a just society look like--what would be its features? How is one to be achieved?

maybay said:

I should not be concerned with building a just society.

Malcolm wrote:

It is comforting to know that the Mahāyāna tradition does not share your social pessimism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 16th, 2016 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

conebeckham said:

Where do you live? How were you educated? Can you deny the benefit of society, any society, in your life? I just.....nevermind.

Malcolm wrote:

My guess, someone from a former Communist bloc country.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 16th, 2016 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Saoshun said:

@Malcolm

Capitalism itself it's just the way of the money and economy moves.

Malcolm wrote:

Capitalism is an ideology every bit as much as Marxist-Lenism.

Saoshun said:

To be leftist you need only repeat slogan which you do not understand (it's just example not pointing out) or who have not any resonance with reality or happen in reality but only sound nice.

Malcolm wrote:

The same is true of the right.

Saoshun said:

To be right (right winged means RIGHT minded really) you need to have reasoning first and clarity of what happen in the times and situation rather than spoke things just because they are nice which do not exclude being nice.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, just like Rush Limbaugh.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2016 at 11:34 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Saoshun said:

Also, the problem with leftist people they can spread all kinds of hypocrisy, feminism etc. because of the history of the strong western right wing hand which created the best civilization in the world, the west were so healthy so powerful that the strength of our ancestor which suffered well to build the best civilization in the world still keeping up this bull turd but if we would start with idea of feminism, leftist, socialism, we would not even survive to those days already conquered by other lower barbarian.

Malcolm wrote:

Lower barbarians? You are aware that the US and Canada, as well as the countries in

Latin America exist only because of a wholesale policy of racial genocide exercised for 400 years?

Saoshun said:

We would be like Indian or Africans, still in the turd-houses.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the effect of 500 years of colonialism.

Saoshun said:

That's the harsh truth, and we can wiggle tails and spread the funny socialist ideas but do it on the ground of the pure western right wing traditional civilization which is easy to do, till the ground it's get weaker and we say bye. It's just sad for me that fellow Buddhists fall for it. All those things are sweet till life get you or other fanatics which bomb himself screaming "allah akbar" and then just scream in TV about socialturdism that he blow himself up or raped because we on the west are racists or we should have more equal rights and because the west is bad. Guys wake up till it's not to late and spread the message otherwise we are done.

Malcolm wrote:

You sound pretty much like Donald J. Trump.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2016 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: Clarity

Content:

Queequeg said:

To be completely honest, I only have a vague idea as to what adhimokkha means (also Skt. adhimukti). ?

Malcolm wrote:

It primarily means inclination, interest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2016 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Saoshun said:

I think now of creating right wing buddhist movement. (but do not think of trump or something like that)

Malcolm wrote:

And how is Capitalism going to help anything? It is destroying the planet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2016 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Saoshun said:

Why (mostly in tibetan buddhism) there are so many leftists people who believe socialist dream? It's discredid the buddhism as real thing.

because people who cannot realize simple truth of life will not recognize genuine dharma, so forgot about enlightenment if you are leftist by system not by compassion.

Malcolm wrote:

I am a Green, which is leftist by definition. My political views are influenced primarily by Arne Naess, but also by Murray Bookchin, etc., many people in the international Ecology/Peace movement.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2016 at 10:30 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

This is not a question of equality. Provisioning for women in education will not increase the distribution of educated people in society, it will shore up intelligence in the wealthy, who typically marry each other.

Malcolm wrote:

Obviously this is wrong, literacy rates are the highest they have ever been in human history, and educating women is a proven way to reduce birth rates.

maybay said:

Inequality is at its <http://www.economist.com/news/finance-and-economics/21621908-what-impressive-work-economic-history-tells-you-about-inequality-breaking>. I don't dispute that education has increased. I say its distribution is unequal. At the end of the day husbands and wives sleep in the same bed, but poor people in other countries have no reprieve, and the only solace they might find in the narcissistic issues forwarded by developed nations is the possibility of joining them - which is the elites' worst nightmare. Unless these people are educated, in which case the most ambitious and unattached will emigrate, and they take all their horror stories with them, partly to earn sympathy and attention, partly as a poultice for their conscience.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, globally speaking, income inequality has never been higher in human history, this is perfectly true. But this state of affairs will not continue forever, or it will shift

somewhere else. After all, it used to be the case that Europe was largely quite poor in comparison with China, the Muslim world and so on, and it was only the Columbian exchange which gave the Europeans and their descendants the present global dominance they presently enjoy.

In the meantime, while regressive forces such as Boko Haram may be may be acute, they are limited. In general, most people wish to emulate the lifestyle of Europe and North America, our civil liberties and opportunities, unequal though they may be when compared to the global economy as a whole. And for as long as people aspire to emulate our civil liberties and opportunities, they will continue advertise their support for equal rights, democracy and so on., as they do now, no matter how inexpertly or superficially.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2016 at 9:31 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

DGA said:

Boko Haram

Malcolm wrote:

Means something like "Western Education (boko) Sucks (haram)."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2016 at 7:50 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Of course there would be less force and coercion. The reason force and coercion are necessary is because there is an attempt to impose an idea (the fundamental INequality of men and women) onto an obviously dissonant reality (the fundamental EQUALITY of men and women). When you try to put a square peg into a round hole, you are forced to use a hammer at some point.

maybay said:

This is not a question of equality. Provisioning for women in education will not increase the distribution of educated people in society, it will shore up intelligence in the wealthy, who typically marry each other.

Malcolm wrote:

Obviously this is wrong, literacy rates are the highest they have ever been in human history, and educating women is a proven way to reduce birth rates.

maybay said:

Worse still is that the people whose minds you wish to turn will then only see you in the light of greed, and they will see your call for equality for women as a ruse to disempower the men, their unity, and their country. And this will cause them to double down on authoritarian rulership, to find solidarity with other authoritarian regimes, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Peoples begin setting things right in their society when they finally realize they are squandering a social resource, the intelligence, resilience, and cleverness of women.

maybay said:

In a state of nature men and women are not equal. They are different.

Malcolm wrote:

Different does not mean unequal. Dogs and bitches are not the same, but they are not unequal. Equality and sameness are not coterminous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2016 at 7:48 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

Perhaps when equality is achieved, there will be less ongoing force and coercion.

Sherab Dorje said:

Of course there would be less force and coercion. The reason force and coercion are necessary is because there is an attempt to impose an idea (the fundamental INequality of men and women) onto an obviously dissonant reality (the fundamental EQUALITY of men and women). When you try to put a square peg into a round hole, you are forced to use a hammer at some point.

maybay said:

This is not a question of equality. Provisioning for women in education will not increase the distribution of educated people in society, it will shore up intelligence in the wealthy, who typically marry each other.

Malcolm wrote:

Obviously this is wrong, literacy rates are the highest they have ever been in human history, and educating women is a proven way to reduce birth rates.

maybay said:

This is a question of justice, which should be balanced against other principles of

welfare. But the force you are talking about is largely unsolicited and coming from outside of these societies, which is unjust. Take Martin Luther King's hyperbole 'Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.' This approach has led to skilful change in some countries through embargo (such as South Africa), but only when the unjust group was of little economic value. The hypocrisy is evident when a group continues to enjoy economic benefit with another while being at odds with their principles. So forcefully liberate the Saudi people from their oppressive government if it means so much to you (I don't support this) but don't continue to buy their oil while decrying their iniquity. You need to make honour an implicit requirement for trade. Otherwise it is just your greed that is powering their inequality (not the cause, but the condition. See my previous posts). Worse still is that the people whose minds you wish to turn will then only see you in the light of greed, and they will see your call for equality for women as a ruse to disempower the men, their unity, and their country. And this will cause them to double down on authoritarian rulership, to find solidarity with other authoritarian regimes, etc.

In a state of nature men and women are not equal. They are different.

Malcolm wrote:

Different does not mean unequal. Dogs and bitches are not the same, but they are not unequal. Equality and sameness are not coterminous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2016 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: Mechanics of Enlightenment

Content:

Astus said:

What more do you want?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2016 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: Clarity

Content:

Queequeg said:

is there clarity in the moment of transmission?

Malcolm wrote:

The experience of clarity can be used a vehicle for transmission, just as can an experience of nonconceptuality or bliss. Since there are three realms, they are each dominated by one of three major experiences, when not recognized for what they are. Attachment to bliss causes rebirth in the desire realm; attachment to clarity causes rebirth in the form realm; attachment to nonconceptuality causes rebirth in the formless realm.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2016 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: Clarity

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

So clarity simply describes the absence of affliction, or it is what is there without the afflictions and obscurations?

Malcolm wrote:

It describes its essential nature which is distinct, and its power, which encompasses objects of knowledge.

For example, look toward your left, then rotate your head to the right all the way. Everything you see is part of your clarity, even though you may not have identified every object in your field of perception.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2016 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: Clarity

Content:

Queequeg said:

Malcolm - don't know if you edited after my response or if I just missed it first go round, but got it.

mind's lack of obstruction

to confirm... this is experiential

Malcolm wrote:

For example, clarity is that lack of obstruction your mind manifests. In reality, it has not obstructions, however, with afflictions, its range and power is limited. For example, powers like clairvoyance developed in meditation are due to strengthening clarity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2016 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: Clarity

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Tony Duff maintains that when it's used as a noun, it is actually just an abbreviation for 'od gsal ba. Is that incorrect?

Malcolm wrote:

Tony Duff maintains many things...

tomamundsen said:

Well I didn't mean to say that in order to pit him against you and argue over who's right and wrong. I'm more curious about why exactly it would not be understood as an abbreviation in that usage? He has an explanation of what gsal ba means as an adjective/adverb: "To be evident to the senses. Although this could be taken as "clear", the term is used in the sense of "obvious", "evident", "distinct", and hence clear to the senses." Which seems to line up with your explanation.

I guess this distinction is more relevant when you're look at an actual instance when translating a text... Maybe not as helpful when just trying to understand the word.

Malcolm wrote:

The sanskrit term underlying gsal ba is vivṛta (and a few other terms that mean the same thing). For example, in one commentary on Hevajra, we find གསལ་བ་ནི་མངོན་པའོ, i.e., "clear" means "evident." A long commentary on Abhidharma states, "Clear means fully knowing, but unclear means it is not clear."

Your mind is empty, because it cannot be established, but it is "clear" because it is distinct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2016 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Clarity

Content:

Queequeg said:

I don't know if this has been discussed before in the forum - a quick search did not readily turn anything up directly on point.

What is Clarity in the context of DC? I've read descriptions, but I'm not getting any clarity.

Malcolm wrote:

"Clarity," gsal ba refers to mind's lack of obstruction. It is sometime conflated with 'od gsal ba, luminosity, which has been discussed at length elsewhere.

tomamundsen said:

Tony Duff maintains that when it's used as a noun, it is actually just an abbreviation for 'od gsal ba. Is that incorrect?

Malcolm wrote:

Tony Duff maintains many things...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 15th, 2016 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: Clarity

Content:

Queequeg said:

I don't know if this has been discussed before in the forum - a quick search did not readily turn anything up directly on point.

What is Clarity in the context of DC? I've read descriptions, but I'm not getting any clarity.

Malcolm wrote:

"Clarity," gsal ba refers to mind's lack of obstruction. It is sometime conflated with 'od gsal ba, luminosity, which has been discussed at length elsewhere.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 14th, 2016 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: What is dharma, according to your understanding?

Content:

wuyouxianren said:

Or alternatively: How many senses can the word "dharma" be used in Buddhist teachings?

Malcolm wrote:

In Buddhism, the word "Dharma" has ten meanings: 1) object of knowledge 2) path 3) Nirvana 4) mental object 5) merit 6) longevity 7) discourse 8) phenomena 9) certainty 10) religious tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 13th, 2016 at 9:11 PM

Title: Re: Intellectualization

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Instead what you are doing is drowning Zen teachings in some beautiful, but not-Zen at all, teachings and expressions, and Zen folks like Dharmagoat and me get stamped down. Here, in "Zen", I am happy to talk to Meido about Zen (respectfully agreeing to disagree sometimes), but I would not charge into the Rinzaï Section and tell him why I think he is a old shavepate and Dogen thought his Ancestors were full of gas etc.

Instead of discussing Zen here, how about we take it outside to Open Forum? Then, let's talk, debate, challenge anything! (Respectfully) no holds barred (within the TOS and Right Speech)

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:

Please read this post:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=33&t=21711&start=20#p333315>

Written by a contemporary Tibetan Khenpo, who fluent in Chinese, also seems to be very expert in Chan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 13th, 2016 at 6:44 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

No, that's not what I'm saying.

Sherab Dorje said:

So please explain, to this idiot, what you are trying to say with the research you posted?

maybay said:

Change is suffering. It should happen skilfully, not forcefully. When I listen to people talking about rights I just don't get the sense that a skillful argument is being made. I hear foot stamping and fists on tables. I search for something in what they have said that suggests humility – a recognition that they may not have all the facts, that they perhaps do not fully understand the issues, and that the outcomes are ultimately out of their control. Too often I come back empty handed.

Malcolm wrote:

Glasses are for looking outside, mirrors are for looking inside. Perhaps you need to use a mirror more frequently than glasses if your inquiry keeps coming up empty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 13th, 2016 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: The practice as an obstacle

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When infinite obstacles arise for those who are properly practicing the sublime Dharma, the sole method for removing them is to supplicate the guru. An instruction better than that has never been taught, is not taught and will never be taught by all the buddhas of the three times. When all obstacles are removed, because of that, siddhi is attained.

Based upon that, also all paths are traversed.

-- Guru Padmasambhava

heart said:

good post!

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Comes from the zhal gdams snying byang of the Bar chad kun sel.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2016 at 11:32 PM

Title: Re: The practice as an obstacle

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When infinite obstacles arise for those who are properly practicing the sublime Dharma, the sole method for removing them is to supplicate the guru. An instruction better than that has never been taught, is not taught and will never be taught by all the buddhas of the three times. When all obstacles are removed, because of that, siddhi is attained.

Based upon that, also all paths are traversed.

-- Guru Padmasambhava

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2016 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: Intellectualization

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is very simple. Chan/Zen is those traditions that lay claim to being heirs and preservers of the teachings of Bodhidharma and his followers. We don't need a metadiscussion to understand this much.

jundo cohen said:

I believe you are now engaging in meta-discussion.

Gassho, J

Malcolm wrote:

I had this reply in mind, as well as the posts to which you are replying.

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=69&t=22419&start=60#p333127>

[metadiscussion on]

It frankly gets a bit boring to watch you unnecessarily defending the Zen forums from "invasions." If there is a problem in the Zen forums, hit the report button, and let the mods sort it out. [metadiscussion off]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2016 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: Intellectualization

Content:

Astus said:

How can you expect keeping Zen in the Zen forum if you don't specify what Zen is?

jundo cohen said:

Well, ya know, they say that everything is Zen, so theoretically one can talk here about baseball, politics, leaky sink fixing. Jesus and the Beverly Hills Housewives ... all "Zen".

But it probably means (with a few grayish areas) folks who follow and have trust in the teachings of Soto/Caodong or Rinzai/ILinji lines, much as "Nichiren" Buddhism means folks who are trusting and following the teachings of Nichiren.

Gassho, J

Malcolm wrote:

It is very simple. Chan/Zen is those traditions that lay claim to being heirs and preservers of the teachings of Bodhidharma and his followers. We dont need a metadiscussion to understand this much.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2016 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: Intellectualization

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Way too much meta-discussion going on here...

jundo cohen said:

DHA asked, I simply responded respectfully.

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:

Check the TOS.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 12th, 2016 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Intellectualization

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Way too much meta-discussion going on here...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 11th, 2016 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One can read this charitably, and understand that it is so awful being a woman in this world, one would want to be born somewhere where there is no gender. Often, this is how teachers try to gloss this passage. However, in the sūtra, no mention is made of the one hundred faults, or even single fault of being a male. It is made clear in this text that being male is preferable to being female. This sentiment is not uncommon in the sūtras. And we very often find women in Buddhist literature referring to themselves as being of inferior births because they are women.

People should think long and hard about these things, and not dismiss concern such imagery as being of no consequence.

maybay said:

With this logic anyone who says samsara is suffering should be given blows to the neck and groin. The essence of what you are saying is that a view of how things are, combined with modern pragmatism, results in reaffirming the state of things. The call to fight for rights does not liberate us from the conditions that deny them to us, it mires us in trying to fix what the sutras have always told us is beyond repair.

Malcolm wrote:

You seem to fail to understand that in order to give something away, first you must own it. If you give away or sell something which you do not own, in Buddhadharma this is considered theft. In order to give away your wife and children, no matter how unbearable it may seem to you to do so, as was the case in this jataka, the tacit understanding is that they are your property which can in fact be disposed of as you wish.

Your argument, "The call to fight for rights does not liberate us from the conditions that deny them to us, it mires us in trying to fix what the sutras have always told us is beyond repair," is morally bankrupt in so far as it suggests that the struggle for human freedom and rights (as well as the freedoms and rights of animals, plants, and all other living things) ought to be abandoned at the outset because it is "samsaric," and from a Mahāyāna point of view, is even more problematical, because it is predicated on the mistaken idea that one should never strive to improve conditions which result in temporary happiness for sentient beings. The Buddha himself never hesitated to advise rulers to understand the rights of their subjects and their own obligation to defend those rights. In fact, improving the temporary conditions of sentient beings through supporting the struggle for human rights in general, and women's rights specifically, properly falls within the Mahāyāna's four means of conversion (offering protection). Indeed, your reactionary dissent shows that you have utterly failed to understand that Mahāyāna Buddhists should be in the vanguard of the struggle for human and ecological rights precisely because aiding those who are in need of protection and emancipation (and there is no better way to ensure secular protections

and emancipation than through social justice predicated on a theory of intrinsic rights) precisely falls within the activity of a bodhisattva, for example, HH Dalai Lama, Bhikku Bodhi, Roshi Glassman, Thich Naht Hahn and many others.

While the seeds of the emancipation of women, the explicit condemnation of slavery and human trafficking, and so on, can all be found in the twelve limbs of the Buddha's teachings, so too can regressive attitudes and practices, such as the patriarchal notion and practice of considering women and children to be the property of husbands and fathers.

Buddhists need to be honest about these patriarchal memes in Buddhist core literature, as well as secondary literature, and understand them, analyze them, and not make wan excuses for their presence in our Dharma traditions. Why? Well, for one, in the West, arguably, the majority of active practitioners of Buddhadharma appear to be women. Buddhadharma must accommodate this situation. To accommodate it, we must recognize that within Buddhadharma sexist and patriarchal culture forms have been preserved and promulgated, which has lead to the disenfranchisement of women. For example, given the literary output of Western women in the past 100 years, one can hardly imagine any other reason there are so few women Buddhist authors in the past 2500 years than the fact that women were systematically barred from higher education and that their gender was the reason they were barred from such educations. The institutionalization of patriarchal norms in Buddhadharma is found right at the beginning of the bhikṣuni sangha, when it was declared that even the most senior bhikṣunis were required to bow to and sit behind male novices.

The time for this to change has arrived. It is changing, and we should be supportive of these changes. For the first time in history there are women Geshe, thanks to HHDL, and so on. Male dominance in Buddhadharma is coming to an end, as it should, and for the first time in history, women are finding their voices in the Dharma. We should recognize that wholesale suppression of the Dharma voices of human women (as opposed the transvaluation of women's voices as *ḍākinīs* and so on, something extraordinary as opposed to something ordinary) for the past 2500 is a loss to the Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 11th, 2016 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

Dundee said:

DGA just what I see in the news. This was a discussion I did not want to get trapped in. The question I asked did not actually get addressed and as one person put it the "soapie" or "soap opera" as it is also called continues. This topic might be better left to the Azealia Banks and Sarah Palins of this world. Myoho-Nameless you have a very different perspective and that is interesting.

I just try to keep my mind steady so it doesn't get tossed about by this or that. A strong

mind is the best ally as the Buddha taught.

Malcolm wrote:

It always astonishes me when people who follow Buddhadharma are unwilling to address one of the chief causes of suffering among human beings, the exploitation of and discrimination against women, and are unwilling to take a hard look at the inequality women have been subjected to in Buddhist countries and how women are portrayed. For example, in the sūtra of the Guru of Medicine, this sentiment is expressed: When I have attained the the awakening at of actualizing buddhahood in that unsurpassed perfect, complete awakening, any women who are afflicted by the one hundred faults of womanhood, who decry the state of womanhood, who wish to be completely liberated from birthplaces of women, they will turn away from the state of womanhood, and until they have attained the state of awakening will be born with a male gender.

One can read this charitably, and understand that it is so awful being a woman in this world, one would want to be born somewhere where there is no gender. Often, this is how teachers try to gloss this passage. However, in the sūtra, no mention is made of the one hundred faults, or even single fault of being a male. It is made clear in this text that being male is preferable to being female. This sentiment is not uncommon in the sūtras. And we very often find women in Buddhist literature referring to themselves as being of inferior births because they are women.

People should think long and hard about these things, and not dismiss concern such imagery as being of no consequence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 10th, 2016 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Bliss in Zen (sukha)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

PS - Our is a "way beyond words and letters". Some interesting research on the origins of this phrase in recent years. Radicals would burn all the Sutras and Commentaries before reading them, but most (like Dogen) would read them first then "burn them " (figuratively or literally). The point is not to be ignorant of traditional Mahayana doctrine, but not to be imprisoned by it, to expose its juice by bending it into almost unrecognizable sometimes iconoclastic or seemingly heretical forms, and to leap free.

Malcolm wrote:

According to Tibetan sources, what Bodhidharma said was that once one has ascertained the view, do not rely on sūtras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 10th, 2016 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

If you read it you would understand that this point is dealt with in the jataka and that it caused the bodhisattva great pain. But you've obviously made up your mind about your phantom demon so carry on. Its no wonder religious fanaticism arises as such a force in this world when people like you cultivate it at every opportunity.

Malcolm wrote:

I understand that even today woman and children in India and other places in the world are daily sold into slavery, and this is because they are born in a world society that is rampantly patriarchal. The jataka tale is a story that could happen only in a society where women and children are essentially regarded as property rather than as people who possess inherent rights to their own persons.

The only religious fanatacism here is the one that would seek to defend what is indefensible, i.e., treating women and children as property which can be given away.

Your final comment is a pure ad hominem and is inappropriate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 10th, 2016 at 10:45 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

To give without any expectation of what will happen, without attachment in other words, is the perfection of generosity. And that is what this literature, not a sutra, is meant to illustrate.

Malcolm wrote:

To give away another person into slavery is simply wrong. I understand the point it is meant to illustrate, and I also understand that it communicates patriarchal entitlement as well.

Jatakas are the Buddha's own recollections of his past lives. They are included in the twelve branches of the Buddha's teachings. They are Buddha vacana, and not merely "literature." They are included in the bka' 'gyur.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2016 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

DGA said:

What's patriarchy?

Malcolm wrote:

A social system in which women and their civil rights are not recognized and are systematically denied.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2016 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

How about a link Malcolm?

Malcolm wrote:

You will find it recounted in the section on the perfection of generosity in Sakya Pandita's Clarifying the Muni's Intent, which can be found in the recent publication, Stages of the Doctrine, published by the Library of Tibetan Classics.

maybay said:

What is the name of the sutra please. And also you can explain what is blameworthy in giving up wife and children, and also how it should not be seen as, if anything, a slight toward Brahminism, rather than what you are suggesting.

Malcolm wrote:

This story is part of the Vessantara Jataka, as Sapan says:

"Here, one should reflect on and demonstrate to others the Jataka tales of how Viśvaṃtara gave his wife and children to be the slaves of a brahmin..."

There is nothing blameworthy in giving up one's wife and family, per se. But giving them up as slaves to a brahmin in order to perfect generosity could only be seen as laudable in an extremely patriarchal civilization where women and children have no legal status as holders of personal rights.

The story illustrates that in highly venerated Indian Buddhist Sūtras, a man's family was considered his chattel, to be disposed of as he wished, however he wished.

It is one of the most famous of all the Jatakas, carved into the walls of Angkor Wat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2016 at 7:29 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is the famous account of the bodhisattva who voluntarily gives his wife and children up to a brahmin as slaves...do you really want me to go on?

maybay said:

'Famous' is one of those subjective adjectives beyond dispute. If you question it you only suggest your own ignorance.

Scholars should be the last people to use this word.

Malcolm wrote:

Unless they are referring to something which indeed is famous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2016 at 7:27 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

maybay said:

How about a link Malcolm?

Malcolm wrote:

You will find it recounted in the section on the perfection of generosity in Sakya Pandita's Clarifying the Muni's Intent, which can be found in the recent publication, Stages of the Doctrine, published by the Library of Tibetan Classics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2016 at 6:02 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

Tenso said:

There may some minor misogynistic references here and there but let me know when you find one that advocates the beating of women or using them as sex slaves.

Malcolm wrote:

There is the famous account of the bodhisattva who voluntarily gives his wife and children up to a brahmin as slaves...do you really want me to go on?

Tenso said:

Why would I believe in such stories? A true bodhisattva would never do such a thing.

Malcolm wrote:

You made the argument that such misogyny could not be found in the sutras, and yet, this is an account found in the very Mahayana sutras you claim cannot have such misogyny.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2016 at 10:53 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you wish to find misogyny, you need look no further than Buddhist sutras.

Tenso said:

There may some minor misogynistic references here and there but let me know when you find one that advocates the beating of women or using them as sex slaves.

Malcolm wrote:

There is the famous account of the bodhisattva who voluntarily gives his wife and children up to a brahmin as slaves...do you really want me to go on?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2016 at 9:53 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That is an ill-considered statement, especially in light of your indignant outburst decrying Islamic mysogyny, and proclaiming it worse than mysogyny in Buddhist cultures.

Tenso said:

You should know better than to conflate Buddhism with misogynistic cultures it finds itself in. The Buddha was very progressive and lenient with women for his time. A lot of the misogyny in Islamic cultures on the hand is derived straight from the Quran.

Malcolm wrote:

If you wish to find misogyny, you need look no further than Buddhist sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2016 at 9:19 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

Tenso said:

I wouldn't consider DK to be a Buddhist at all.

Malcolm wrote:

That is an ill-considered statement, especially in light of your indignant outburst decrying Islamic mysogyny, and proclaiming it worse than mysogyny in Buddhist cultures.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2016 at 8:43 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

I still don't understand what that has to do with the conversation, the fact that Islam, and some of it's writings contain horrible shit against women (BTW things like stoning adulteress is found in texts important to all 3 Abrahamic faiths AFAIK) has nothing to do with whether or not Buddhist misogyny is ok.

Tenso said:

For the tenth time it is not ok and Buddhists should do their best to deal with it. Just wanted to point out that we are still in a much better position than a religion like Islam which is misogynist to its core.

Malcolm wrote:

So we are to understand that DK's "absolutely sickening" misogyny is far superior to mysogyny in Islamic cultures?

I guess you were unaware that in Buddhist Sanskrit literature the noun for "women" literally translates into English as "inferior birth."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2016 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar khyentse... monk?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The reality is that Ngakpa's garb, hair and so on are symbols of freedom from contrivance. Spending a lot of time being worried about one's gear sort of defeats that purpose.

Sherab Dorje said:

Sometimes wearing the garb is a matter of samaya.

Malcolm wrote:

In the Dudjom tradition hair empowerment (which I have received twice in its entirety), specific gear is not mentioned. When you receive it, you are supposed to maintain uncontrived hair, conduct and mind, and that is all.

In KDL's terma tradition (which I have also received), it is more elaborate, but the main thing is to not cut one's hair.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2016 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar khyentse... monk?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Striped zen doesn't mean anything.

conebeckham said:

Depends, eh?

At some centers it's a "badge of rank," and those within that framework recognize it as such. Various it's referred to as a DrupDra Zen, or Tummo Zen, etc. At some centers it's worn to distinguish merely serious lay practitioners from monks, who wear solid maroon. Some centers encourage the straight white zen for layfolk, while wearing a straight white zen at other centers is taboo--unless you're "qualified."

Then again, wearing any sort of clothing really is no sign of anything. Perhaps that's what you mean. Some dress as monks, and are not monks. Dzongsar Khyentse Rinpoche's comments are pretty clear, I think, in that regard.

Malcolm wrote:

The reality is that Ngakpa's garb, hair and so on are symbols of freedom from contrivance. Spending a lot of time being worried about one's gear sort of defeats that purpose.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 9th, 2016 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzongsar khyentse... monk?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He is wearing a striped zen over a lay person's robe. But normally, HH Dudjom R. dressed like a Tibetan aristocrat.

Nakpa robes mean the whole kit

Adamantine said:

Well wearing a striped ngakpa zen while keeping long hair still differentiates you from being a) a monk and b) merely a layperson with primarily worldly concerns even if you aren't wearing the entire uniform. I think HH Dudjom R was at a level where relative things did not matter much however he still made the effort to show the ngakpa signs at various occasions which contradicts the sentiment in that article. But if you want to

split hairs there's this pic and more:

Malcolm wrote:

Pretty sure Dudjom R. mostly wore aristocrat's robes.

Striped zen doesn't mean anything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 8th, 2016 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I did not defend Drugpa Kunley. Maybay clearly has a very high opinion of DK. I pointed out that he was reducing his hero to the level of your statement, and that nevertheless, DK's statements should not be used to justify the objectification of women.

Tenso said:

What is your opinion of DK?

Malcolm wrote:

My opinion of Drukpa Kunlay's autobiography is that in the context of Tibetan culture, it is very bawdy, ribald, entertaining, and that for Tibetans it represents a kind of transgressive taboo breaking of an awakened person, in imitation of Indian Mahāsiddhas.

It is nevertheless sited within Himalayan patriarchal culture, and his attitude towards women, and that of 15th century Bhutanese men in general, leaves much to be desired from a modern perspective, much as, from a feminist perspective, Buddhism as a whole is rife with sexism. If you are not a woman, you might not be aware of how much the sexism in Buddhism is hurtful to our sisters, mothers, and daughters.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 8th, 2016 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: Dzongsar khyentse... monk?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Adamantine! Do you know what the Wylie for phagen is? I'm having trouble looking that up as it's spelled.

dzogchungpa said:

Maybe this: http://rywiki.tsadra.org/index.php/pha_rgan

Regarding the OP, there's some relevant info here:
<http://all-otr.org/public-talks/8-the-grilling>

Adamantine said:

Well from that article I take exception to this, very odd comment: "And even Kyabje Dudjom Rinpoche, for example, didn't ever wear the robes of a ngakpa; he always dressed as a householder."

What would you say he is wearing here?

If you look at this album you'll see almost every photo he is wearing ngakpa robes. . .on various occasions. <http://www.tersar.org/lineage-and-teachers-photo-galleries/teachers-gallery/>

Malcolm wrote:

He is wearing a stripped zen over a lay person's robe. But normally, HH Dudjom R. dressed like a Tibetan aristocrat.

Nakpa robes mean the whole kit:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 8th, 2016 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Illuminating Quotes by Malcolm Namdrol-la

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Samsara itself is a bardo, as is awakening. It does not matter how many "lifetimes" we spend in it, since the mind stream itself does not die, but in each lifetime, appropriates a new form.

The bardo of samsara begins with delusion and ends with awakening, there is no "afterlife."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 8th, 2016 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

When people slut shamed Melania Trump on face book, I called them out for that.
When people fat shamed Chrus Christie, I called them out for that.

Tenso said:

Funny as hell when you freak out at that one little comment I made while defending Drukpa Kunley. Probably some of the most misogynistic material I've ever read. Would be way too graphic to even post anything of his on here. Absolutely sickening and your

hypocrisy on this issue is very revealing.

Malcolm wrote:

I did not defend Drugpa Kunley. Maybay clearly has a very high opinion of DK. I pointed out that he was reducing his hero to the level of your statement, and that nevertheless, DK's statements should not be used to justify the objectification of women.

Was Tibet a patriarchal culture where women were treated poorly? Of course it was.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 8th, 2016 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Bliss in Zen (sukha)

Content:

Wayfarer said:

Experiences of bliss or of dukkha come and go as all experiences do.

Great bliss is not an experience which comes and goes.

But realising emptiness isn't an experience - it's an insight into the the transitory nature of all experience.

Malcolm wrote:

No. It is more than that. It is the realization that all phenomena have never arisen from the beginning, as it says in the Prajñāpāramita:

Mañjuśrī, "What which arises in dependence in reality never arose."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2016 at 9:21 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Tom said:

Gelugpas classify some conceptual cognitions as direct realizes (དངོས་ལྟ་རྟོགས་པ་) because they say that they realize their object through the force of experience. Examples include the second moment of an inferential cognition and also memory.

Certainly, Dignaga who defines direct perception as "that which is free from conceptualization (kalpanā)" would protest and then Dharmakīrti would follow, and then Candrakīrti would also object.

Malcolm wrote:

And this because they follow the system Phyapa as noted above...

Tom said:

Sorry, if i'm repeating something above... only read the last couple of posts.

Malcolm wrote:
No worries Tom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2016 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Tom said:

Gelugpas classify some conceptual cognitions as direct realizes (དངོས་ལྟ་རྟགས་པ་) because they say that they realize their object through the force of experience. Examples include the second moment of an inferential cognition and also memory.

Certainly, Dignaga who defines direct perception as “that which is free from conceptualization (kalpanā)” would protest and then Dharmakīrti would follow, and then Candrakīrti would also object.

Malcolm wrote:
.but these too are not direct perceptions.

Tom said:

A distinction is made here between མངོན་ལྟ་རྟགས་པ་ and དངོས་ལྟ་རྟགས་པ་.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, the formere is a direct perception, tne latter cannot be.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2016 at 9:18 AM

Title: Re: Bliss in Zen (sukha)

Content:

Wayfarer said:

realising it relies on a complete transformation of perception and if we say 'well there's nothing to realise' then why not simply stay as we are?

Astus said:

To stay as we are would mean being lost in the concepts of gain and loss. Seeing that all is empty means that there is nothing that can be grasped. When there is nothing to be grasped, there is no attachment, and without attachment there is no suffering. But nothing to grasp doesn't mean total blankness, it means that all experiences constantly change, hence nothing to rely on. That is the non-abiding mind, but not simply mindlessness.

Realisation pertains to the nature of reality, or to the 'nature of all experience' if you like. As I understand it, that is why realisation is for keeps, it doesn't come and go
The realisation is the realisation of all being in a flux. It is giving up the mistaken idea of permanence, and one that misconception is completely removed, there is no view attached to, and that lack of grasping doesn't come and go.

Malcolm wrote:

Apart from what has fluctuated and not fluctuated, there is presently no fluctuation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2016 at 9:03 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Tom said:

Gelugpas classify some conceptual cognitions as direct realizes (དངོས་ལྟ་རྟོགས་པ་) because they say that they realize their object through the force of experience. Examples include the second moment of an inferential cognition and also memory.

Certainly, Dignaga who defines direct perception as "that which is free from conceptualization (kalpanā)" would protest and then Dharmakīrti would follow, and then Candrakīrti would also object.

Malcolm wrote:

And this because they follow the system Phyapa as noted above...but these too are not direct perceptions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2016 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: Bliss in Zen (sukha)

Content:

DGA said:

Dogen fan.

Malcolm wrote:

Definitely, Dogen is very interesting. Good thing they revived the study of Dogen in Soto.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2016 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: Bliss in Zen (sukha)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

If you cannot describe this "radical non-lookers, to the marrow non-searchers", taking the posture for the sake of the posture, then you are simply not describing Soto Zen Shikantaza. Period. You are describing what is certainly an amazing approach or technique for many people, I am sure, but you are describing a helicopter.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no technique: there is only recognition, realization and awakening. Meditation is a distraction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2016 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are two kinds of prāmāṇas (valid cognizers): direct perceptions and inferences. The former are always non-conceptual, the latter are always conceptual.

Tsongkhapafan said:

That's a Sautrantika viewpoint.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess that makes Candrakīrti a Sautrantrika.

Tsongkhapafan said:

That is not a direct perception (pratyakṣa), that is an inference (anumāṇa).

It's not an inference because it doesn't depend on reasons.

Malcolm wrote:

You are confusing inference for syllogism. A syllogism is an inference for another.

Tsongkhapafan said:

The object (generic image of emptiness) is manifest. A cognizer that apprehends a manifest object is a direct perceiver.

Malcolm wrote:

A generic image is strictly an inference. For example, when you see smoke, you infer there is a fire.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2016 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

conebeckham said:

Tsongkhapafan, can you give us an example of a valid cognition that is a conceptual direct perception?

Tsongkhapafan said:

A valid cognition of the generic image of emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not a direct perception (pratyakṣa), that is an inference (anumāṇa).

There are two kinds of prāmāṇas (valid cognizers): direct perceptions and inferences. The former are always non-conceptual, the latter are always conceptual.

One might include a third, testimony of a reliable witness, but not everyone will accept this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2016 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: Bliss in Zen (sukha)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

And perhaps "emptiness is emptiness" is not quite correct. I believe there are different approaches and interpretations of what this is too in various Traditions, but that is for another day.

Malcolm wrote:

Interpretations of and approaches to emptiness are not important. Realization of emptiness is important.

Gate gate paragate parasamgate bodhi svāhā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2016 at 2:46 AM

Title: Re: Bliss in Zen (sukha)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Maybe some of the more scholarly and intelligent types than me around here like Astus and Anders will say I am wrong, and it is just my blindness. I would like to hear what they feel about this.

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:

Jundo, your inner sectarian is showing.

Emptiness is emptiness. There is only one way to realize it, which is, to realize it. Everything else is bullshit.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2016 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Direct perception can also be conceptual. All that direct perception means is that something is apprehended without depending upon reasons. There are two types of valid cognizers, direct valid cognizers and inferential valid cognizers. The former category contains direct perceivers which are both conceptual and non-conceptual.

Malcolm wrote:

No, direct perceptions can never be conceptual, and Candrakīrti agrees that this is so, in fact, he insists on it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2016 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Bliss in Zen (sukha)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

But I am still struggling to see so much of this as Soto Zen Practice or descriptions to which Soto Zen/Shikantaza folks would relate.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, Jundo, what is being said is that there no difference at all between Soto and other Mahāyāna paths, other than words and rhetoric.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, April 7th, 2016 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Bliss in Zen (sukha)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāsiddha Virupa chimes in:

All sentient beings are emanations of mahāmudra, the essence of those emanations is the forever non-arising dharmadhātu, also all characteristics of dualistic appearances, happiness, suffering and so on, are the play of mahāmudrā, the original dharmatā.

Because there is no truth and nothing on which to rely in play itself, reality never transcends the seal of emptiness.

Some are completely tortured with empowerment rites,
some always count their rosary saying hūm phaṭ,
some consume shit, piss, blood, semen and meat,
some meditate the yoga of channels and winds, but all are deluded.

And:

That great profound term “mahāmudrā”,
whatever it’s basis of designation is, also has the label “empty”;
as moments are empty by nature who realizes selflessness?
There is no realizer, just a name, a term, a label,
Also that is not perfect, a projection of disciples,
also in disciples there is no self, similar with illusions and emanations,
“Mahāmudrā” is a mental imputation of the childish.

“Delusion” and “non-delusion” are mere names, mere labels,
who is the person to feel or be aware of delusion?

If not even an iota of the result, nirvana, exists, and is not perceived,
“liberation and non-liberation” is an adventitious reification,
Nothing exists in peaceful and pure space, so what is the path of liberation?

“Ultimate and relative” are also just emphatic labels,
but the two truths don’t exist in the dharmadhātu, the dharmadhātu does not exist.
Mahāsiddha Kotalipa also adds his voice:
Inanimate and animate phenomena
abide as appearances because there is no duality;
they are naturally pure,
peace, space, and immaculate.

Nonduality is a merely a name,
even that name will not exist;
sensation and one who senses are free from signs,
nonduality is great bliss.

Liberated from all concepts,
without the dualism of duality, supreme peace,
like space, liberated from conceptuality,
that is called nondual,

the meditation on the appearances of all phenomena
with the yoga of abiding in the inconceivable.

And:

whether I become a Buddha
or not and go to hell,
hell itself blissful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2016 at 9:33 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

frankc said:

Well at least you say it works both ways. But to quote the glorious Buddha Drukpa Kunley, "Where can I find the best chung and the most beautiful women?"

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing wrong with finding people attractive, but there are ways of expressing one's admiration for them other than by suggesting that most men are so puerile that would "give their left nut" in order to be with them.

Tenso said:

Yeah you need to chill. I wasn't being serious.

Malcolm wrote:

When people slut shamed Melania Trump on face book, I called them out for that. When people fat shamed Chrus Christie, I called them out for that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, April 6th, 2016 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For example, he states in his commentary to the MAV:

The wisdom that knows all aspects
is asserted to have the characteristic of a direct perception.

cloudburst said:

yes, omniscience is completely free from conceptuality. I'm not clear on how your quotation bears on the subject.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is the definition of a direct perception. Your above definition makes it impossible for a direct perception to be non conceptual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

cloudburst said:

there is no such thing as a "collection of stars" independently, so in order for such to appear, there must first be a conceptual act aka imputation. If you directly perceive

things that you do not impute, they must exist independent of imputation. You are claiming that things exist as more than mere name. This is not the first time your realist slip has peeked out from under your madhyamika skirt.

Malcolm wrote:

According to the world, external objects exist independent of our imputations, things such as pots, pillars, and so on, forming the basis of our imputations.

These "facts" are not my point of view, these "facts" are facts known to the world at large. Try explaining to Joe the Plumber that his truck is merely his imputation and enjoy the blank uncomprehending stare you will receive in return.

What I find so strange is why a so called "prasangika" spends so much time on a species of mind-only theory. A proper Prasangika just accepts at face value what the world accepts. Certainly Candrakīrti never makes the distinction you are trying to make, and never would assert that direct perceptions are a result of imputations. For example, he states in his commentary to the MAV:

The wisdom that knows all aspects
is asserted to have the characteristic of a direct perception.

And in the Prasannapāda, he clearly accepts the conventions around direct perceptions and inferences.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

cloudburst said:

Imputations are actions that function as the cause of perception. For example, first you impute the big dipper upon a collection of stars, then it subsequently appears to you.

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, this is the most inane thing you have ever said, and you are not usually given to making such unsupportable assertions. The only way your theory works is with by invoking a theory of universals, for example, the conventionally existent universals proposed by Phya pa (but strictly rejected by Dharmakīrti).

First you see a collection of stars, then you decide to give it a name: direct perception first, imputation second.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

cloudburst said:

Just trying to match the response to the question.... it was an invalid question.

the question seeks an answer based in inherence, and that makes no sense in the end. The truth is, conventionally, that these exist beginninglessly in mutual causation, so "which came first" is pointless, like chicken and egg.

Im not sure what you intend with the 'animals' question, but yes, animals impute objects and perceive things directly as well.

conebeckham said:

Is "perceiving things directly" the same as "imputing objects?"

cloudburst said:

imputing conceptually is the cause of directly perceiving. One could say that the act of direct perception is a mere imputation, but this type of language seems to be muddying this discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

A direct perception is a non-imputing consciousness, by definition. If this were not the case, even the ārya's realization of emptiness through yogic direct perception would be an imputation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Is it right to hold stocks in agriculture if they involve slaughter?

Content:

MiphamFan said:

What about exclusively crop growing producers?

Malcolm wrote:

It is hard to be pure in samsara. You just have to use common sense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Is it right to hold stocks in agriculture if they involve slaughter?

Content:

seeker242 said:

What damage does holding stocks do?

Malcolm wrote:

It is wrong livelihood. One holds stocks with an expectation profits.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 10:32 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan astrology

Content:

maybay said:

Astrology can say something about your personality, but then so can your friends.

They'll instinctively know what colors suit you. Generally a cold personality needs warm colors, and visa versa. Aim for harmony.

Malcolm wrote:

There is really quite a bit more to it than that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

cloudburst said:

Invalid reply -- do animals use names? Do they have direct perceptions?

Just trying to match the response to the question.... it was an invalid question.

the question seeks an answer based in inherence, and that makes no sense in the end.

The truth is, conventionally, that these exist beginninglessly in mutual causation, so

"which came first" is pointless, like chicken and egg.

Im not sure what you intend with the 'animals' question, but yes, animals impute objects and perceive things directly as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Imputations and direct perceptions are mutually causal? No, I don't think so.

Imputations are second order perceptions based on primary perceptions, i.e. direct perceptions. If it were otherwise, you have to invoke a theory of universals to explain perception, and that leads one outside of Dharmakīrti about what is conventionally acceptable very quickly. Universals, like "cowness" are utterly nonexistent abstractions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 8:07 PM

Title: Re: Is it right to hold stocks in agriculture if they involve slaughter?

Content:

MiphamFan said:

Is it right to hold stocks in agricultural producers which also engage in animal

husbandry (which involves slaughter directly or indirectly)?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 7:34 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

Dundee said:

Everybody is an object. Everybody has height, weight, mass and volume. Some men have more height than other men. Some women have a higher volume than other women. Everybody is a living object and nobody can help it

Malcolm wrote:

Lame comment: no one is a commodity, no one should be commodified, and no one should be subject to the oppression of objectification, men, women or children.

There is a direct link between global warming and the objectification and commodification of living beings. Given that this is a Dharma website, I would have thought this was obvious.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 7:27 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

frankc said:

Well at least you say it works both ways. But to quote the glorious Buddha Drukpa Kunley, "Where can I find the best chunga and the most beautiful women?"

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing wrong with finding people attractive, but there are ways of expressing one's admiration for them other than by suggesting that most men are so puerile that they would "give their left nut" in order to be with them.

maybay said:

Care to hear some more Drukpa Kunley quotes?

Malcolm wrote:

If you wish to reduce DK to the level of Tenso's comment, by all means don't let me stop you. But if you think that DK's statements validate the objectification of human beings as objects and commodities...you have not understood anything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 9:53 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Herbie said:

But you are insisting on the difference between "conceptual" and "non-conceptual" which is not within everyday conventions.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is. Mundane worldly convention includes all conventions utilized by mundane people in every area of life.

Herbie said:

your seem to confuse buddhist conventions with everyday conventions.

Malcolm wrote:

The notions of direct perception, etc., do not come from Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 9:49 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Herbie said:

Now you are changing the context of conventions because "direct vs indirect perception" does not belong to the context of everyday conventions but to the context of philosophical conventions.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not the case. Questions of direct perception and inference are entirely mundane and are well within mundane worldly convention.

Herbie said:

But you are insisting on the difference between "conceptual" and "non-conceptual" which is not within everyday conventions.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is. Mundane worldly convention includes all conventions utilized by mundane people in every area of life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 9:33 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

frankc said:

Well at least you say it works both ways. But to quote the glorious Buddha Drukpa Kunley, "Where can I find the best chung and the most beautiful women?"

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing wrong with finding people attractive, but there are ways of expressing one's admiration for them other than by suggesting that most men are so puerile that would "give their left nut" in order to be with them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 9:29 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Herbie said:

That is based on valid cognition of a convention that says that there is "internal" and "external". So that is perfectly fine and I agree with this convention.

Malcolm wrote:

Since external objects are acceptable, also direct perceptions are acceptable as non-conceptual cognitions that do not depend on imputations.

Herbie said:

Now you are changing the context of conventions because "direct vs indirect perception" does not belong to the context of everyday conventions but to the context of philosophical conventions.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not the case. Questions of direct perception and inference are entirely mundane and are well within mundane worldly convention.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 9:03 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Herbie said:

The point in question is just so simply solved: you are taking a Svatantrika perspective which is not mine. That's it!

Malcolm wrote:

No, in fact I am not. Tsongkhapa also accepts the conventional existence of external objects. Why? Because ordinary people do.

Herbie said:

That is based on valid cognition of a convention that says that there is "internal" and "external". So that is perfectly fine and I agree with this convention.

Malcolm wrote:

Since external objects are acceptable, also direct perceptions are acceptable as non-conceptual cognitions that do not depend on imputations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 8:48 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That has nothing to do with the point in question.

Herbie said:

The point in question is just so simply solved: you are taking a Svatantrika perspective which is not mine. That's it!

Malcolm wrote:

No, in fact I am not. Tsongkhapa also accepts the conventional existence of external objects. Why? Because ordinary people do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 8:31 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Tsongkhapa does not contradict Candrakirti on this point anywhere.

Herbie said:

i think Candrakirti's presentation is grounded on the buddhist bhumis which renders it more difficult to extract the pure rational philosophy in contrast to the "Final exposition of wisdom" which actually consists of extracted chapters of Tsongkhapa's works but which is more easily accessible as to its rational philosophical core. One just has to skip certain chapters.

Malcolm wrote:

That has nothing to do with the point in question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 8:04 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Prasanga take the Sautrantika presentation as the base line for conventional truth. I suggest you read Madhyamaka-avatara.

Herbie said:

I prefer to stay with "Final exposition of wisdom" since this is the only work which contains a consistent presentation of Tsongkhapa's Prasangika.

Malcolm wrote:

Tsongkhapa does not contradict Candrakirti on this point anywhere.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 7:54 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Herbie said:

Wow, you have completely abandoned Tsongkhapa with this statement.

Malcolm wrote:

I have not because I make explicit what Tsongkhapa makes ambiguous and blurred.[/quote]

Really, you are too much.

Objects exist conventionally, this means there are external objects.

yes but if you say that objects exist independently of conceptual imputation (which is what you are saying) in the conventional then you are actually taking a Svatantrika perspective, not a Prasangika perspective.[/quote]

The Prasanga take the Sautrantika presentation as the base line for conventional truth. I suggest you read Madhyamaka-avatara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 7:32 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Herbie said:

But you seem to ignore that there are no objects in the first place because they do not inherently exist. There is a sense impression that does not display objects in the first place. Objects only arise out of the sense impression dependent on having arisen dependent on conceptual imputations before.

Malcolm wrote:

Wow, you have completely abandoned Tsongkhapa with this statement. Objects exist conventionally, this means there are external objects.

Your assertion cannot be taken seriously by anyone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 7:19 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

They are inseparable, because there is no perception of something without the ability to apprehend it and what you are apprehending is mere appearance, mere name (mere name doesn't mean only a name).

Malcolm wrote:

Direct perceptions are non-conceptual by definition, so what you propose is impossible.

Herbie said:

i would not say "impossible" but that it is the only way the expression "direct perception" could make sense: you can directly perceive objects only because you are familiar with the conceptual imputations of them. And "you are familiar" means that you are conditioned appropriately before you "directly perceive". So it boils down to the dichotomy of "inherently direct vs. inherently conceptual" being completely inappropriate.

Malcolm wrote:

No, Herbie, direct perceptions are by definition non conceptual. In other words, a direct perception happens when a sense organ and object and a moment of consciousness come together: for example, when an eye consciousness apprehends a blue object before any labeling of the object as blue occurs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 6:53 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Queequeg said:

New York has unexpectedly become a significant contest... I don't remember when NY actually mattered in any primary process.

Ordered and put up the Bernie signs this weekend! I know the studies say lawn signs don't matter...

We live on one of the main streets into and out of our village. Hoping the signs will encourage people and get them thinking, in the words of the Immortal Yankee, Yogi Berra,

IT AINT OVER TIL ITS OVER!

Damn encouraged to see Bernie kick off in the Bronx!

The Boogie Down is the last bastion of New York F'in City!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Nothing exists without a name, not even 'appearance'. Try to refer to anything without using a name.

Malcolm wrote:

Which comes first, a a direct perception or a name?

Tsongkhapafan said:

They are inseparable, because there is no perception of something without the ability to apprehend it and what you are apprehending is mere appearance, mere name (mere name doesn't mean only a name).

Malcolm wrote:

Direct perceptions are non-conceptual by definition, so what you propose is impossible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 2:10 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Commodification/objectification of the human form is very big business these days.

maybay said:

Care to hazard a guess what Ms Trump does for a living?

Malcolm wrote:

I am quite aware of what Ms. Trump does for a living. She had an excellent teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, April 5th, 2016 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Nothing exists without a name, not even 'appearance'. Try to refer to anything without using a name.

Malcolm wrote:

Which comes first, a a direct perception or a name?

cloudburst said:

which came first, the chicken or the egg?

Malcolm wrote:

Invalid reply -- do animals use names? Do they have direct perceptions?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2016 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: translation help

Content:

diamind said:

can anyone help me translate this. possibly correct the spelling. one lama not speaking English wrote this out and gave to me. my tibetan is only limited to be able to write alphabet. thabks

ཕུ་མཁའ་ཀྱི་ངོ་བོ་སྤྱོད་བཤམ་སྐད་གཅིག་མ།

རང་རིག་དོན་གྱི་ངོ་བོ་སྤྱོད་མ་ལ།

འདྲ་འབྲུལ་མེད་པའི་ངང་ནས་གསོལ་བ་འདེབས།

འཁྱུལ་སྐད་གཞི་ལ་དག་པར་བྱིན་གྱིས་སྒྲོལ་བ།

Malcolm wrote:

From a state of inseparability, I supplicate

the ultimate guru, my own vidyā—

a moment of the essence of mind free from proliferation—

bless deluded appearances to be purified in the basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2016 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: The Panama Papers

Content:

Anders said:

I am frankly shocked that the leaks published by a washington-based organisation funded by Ford and Rockefeller have shown dodgy dealings from Putin, Assad, FIFA, third world countries and token Europeans whilst nothing so far have pointed a finger at any US operations

I guess they must be clean as a whistle. Good for them.

Malcolm wrote:

We would never use a firm from Panama...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2016 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: The Perfectly Imperfect Beyond Perfection/Imperfection (Zen) Buddha

Content:

jundo cohen said:

In his book *Faces of Compassion: Classic Bodhisattva Archetypes and Their Modern Expression* (Wisdom Publications, 2012), Soto Zen teacher Taigen Dan Leighton wrote,

"Knowledge (jnana in Sanskrit, etymologically related to the Greek gnosis) is contrasted with wisdom, as this knowledge refers to practical understanding of the workings of phenomena in the conventional world -- not useless knowledge just learned for knowledge's sake, memorizing facts and information by rote as is done for regurgitation on tests in some unimaginative educational systems. As the flip side of wisdom, the perfection of knowledge can be seen as the function or implementation of wisdom -- but fully informed by wisdom's insight into the essential. This knowledge, also referred to as the perfection of truth, is at the service of wisdom, putting wisdom to work in the world."

https://www.amazon.com/Faces-Compassion-Bodhisattva-Archetypes-Expression/dp/0861713338/ref=asap_bc?ie=UTF8

Malcolm wrote:

Statements like this merely indicate the author's lack of familiarity with Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist literature.

Jñāna is deeper than prājñā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2016 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

Nothing exists without a name, not even 'appearance'. Try to refer to anything without using a name.

Malcolm wrote:

Which comes first, a direct perception or a name?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2016 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

frankc said:

Is it sexist and objectifying to be attracted to a girl and openly speak about it?

Malcolm wrote:

It can be.

frankc said:

Does it work both ways?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

frankc said:

Are all the girls that went to see Jacob's shirtless muscle body in the twilight movies sexist and objectifying Jacob?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Commodification/objectification of the human form is very big business these days. It is also quite damaging to many people's feelings of self-worth. Abdullah Öcalan has something interesting to say about this:

Political and military power play quite an important role in maintaining the capitalist system's hegemony. But what is crucial is to possess and subsequently to paralyse society via the cultural industry. The mentality of communities under the influence of the system has weakened and its members have become gullible. Many philosophers claim that society has been turned into a society of the spectacle, similar to the zoo. The sex, sports, arts and culture industries, in combination and in sequence, bombard the emotional and analytic intelligence incessantly by means of a diverse spread of advertisements. As a result, both emotional and analytical intelligence have become completely dysfunctional; the conquering of society's mentality is thus complete.
<http://www.freeocalan.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/liberating-Lifefinal.pdf>

frankc said:

If you were being sarcastic about "most men" being dumbasses then my mistake.

Malcolm wrote:

I was responding the fantasy that when it comes to being in a relationship with a woman, foremost in most men's minds is her putative looks. Indeed, the objectification/exploitation of everything and everyone is the basis of Donald Trump's entire worldview and indeed, his (now failing) campaign.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2016 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: Is optimism bad?

Content:

Boomerang said:

O Realizer of the Transitory World. Don't have,
as objects of your mind,
The eight transitory things of the world:
Namely, material gain and no gain, happiness and unhappiness,
Things nice to hear and not nice to hear, or praise and scorn.
Be indifferent (toward them).

If I've decided that I'm going to live as a lay person, with a career and bills to pay, is it bad for me to be optimistic about achieving success in my worldly endeavors? If I'm going to interact with people daily, is it bad for me to take the optimistic attitude that I am well-liked by my peers? If I have an illness, is it bad for me to be optimistic about recovering?

Malcolm wrote:
It is not a problem to enjoy your life.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, April 4th, 2016 at 11:24 AM
Title: Re: Why is Nichiren Buddhism marginalized in the American Buddhist community?
Content:

dharmapdx said:
Thank you. What you write here is exactly the issue I am facing. I feel that I need an "organized curriculum," and I'm envious that other schools have exactly that.

Malcolm wrote:
Then, you should study in the Tendai school, using Nichiren's works as a modifying reference.

dharmapdx said:
That's actually a great idea. Any book suggestions, websites, etc.? Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:
Talk to DGA.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, April 4th, 2016 at 10:41 AM
Title: Re: Is Consciousness Produced by the Brain?
Content:

Wayfarer said:
Yes, I did say that, not because I was advocating Vedanta, but because of the impossibility of making the mind an object.

The essay by the Dalai Lama says:

As to the question of whether or not a single mental state can observe and examine itself, this has been a very important and difficult question in the Buddhist science of mind. Some Buddhist thinkers have maintained that there is a faculty of mind called "self-consciousness," or "self-awareness." It could be said that this is an apperceptive faculty of mind, one that can observe itself. But this contention has been disputed. Those who maintain that such an apperceptive faculty exists distinguish two aspects within the mental, or cognitive, event. One of these is external and object-oriented in the sense that there is a duality of subject and object, while the other is introspective in nature and it is this that enables the mind to observe itself. The existence of this apperceptive self-cognizing faculty of mind has been disputed, especially by the later Buddhist philosophical school of thought the Prasangika.

Malcolm wrote:

Prasanga is sutra, not tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2016 at 10:35 AM

Title: Re: Sexism (from POTUS 2016)

Content:

Tenso said:

Though, let us not kid ourselves here. Most men would give away their left testicle to be with a woman like Ivanka. Can't really say the same about Heidi no matter how accomplished she is.

Malcolm wrote:

Most men are dumbasses.

frankc said:

Who invented most of the cool stuff? who are the majority of the ordained? who are the majority of scientists? How many men have died defending their family? How many men have died fighting to protect their country? How many men have sacrificed their lives for others? When the titanic went down, who was let off the ship first when men stayed on the ship to sink and die? Were there any feminists on the titanic? Maybe they weren't noticeable after twisting their short crew cut hair into little pigtails and jumping into the nearest life boat. Is anyone triggered? #thetriggering. Does Dharmawheel have a safe space?

Video with men saving people's lives. Dumbasses or heroes?

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LDrd8ELhhvM>

Malcolm wrote:

I was responding to the blatant sexism and objectification of Ivanka Trump in the observation made above. "Most men" obviously would do no such thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, April 4th, 2016 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: Soto-zen, Dogen and reincarnation

Content:

jundo cohen said:

So, in that way, the Buddha himself implied and often directly said that "Karma" and "Rebirth" only exist so long as sentient beings in delusion see the world that way, and they each vanish when we pierce through the dream in Wisdom. Nonetheless, as the fox koan reminds us, we must continue to honor Karma, and seek the good, in our every volitional word, thought and act in this life.

Malcolm wrote:

But it is not so simple as merely deciding, on the basis of a conceptual apprehension of emptiness, that there the nature of reality is free from arising and ceasing. Sentient beings are delusion. As my signature points out, "So called "sentient beings" are merely delusions self-appearing from the dhātu of luminosity."

The point is to realize that true knowledge, the light of which dispels the darkness of delusion. Then we can talk about freedom from birth and death, and the solutions to the other primary existential questions that spur us on the path that leads to awakening.

DGA said:

Malcolm, do you use the word "knowledge " in this context as a direct translation for the Sanskrit jnana? I'm asking because this may be relevant to a parallel discussion

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=107&t=22352>

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, the idea of transcendent knowledge applies here, lokottarajñāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 3rd, 2016 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Soto-zen, Dogen and reincarnation

Content:

jundo cohen said:

So, in that way, the Buddha himself implied and often directly said that "Karma" and "Rebirth" only exist so long as sentient beings in delusion see the world that way, and they each vanish when we pierce through the dream in Wisdom. Nonetheless, as the fox koan reminds us, we must continue to honor Karma, and seek the good, in our every volitional word, thought and act in this life.

Malcolm wrote:

But it is not so simple as merely deciding, on the basis of a conceptual apprehension of emptiness, that there the nature of reality is free from arising and ceasing. Sentient beings are delusion. As my signature points out, "So called "sentient beings" are merely delusions self-appearing from the dhātu of luminosity."

The point is to realize that true knowledge, the light of which dispels the darkness of delusion. Then we can talk about freedom from birth and death, and the solutions to the other primary existential questions that spur us on the path that leads to awakening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 3rd, 2016 at 10:03 PM

Title: Re: Is Consciousness Produced by the Brain?

Content:

Wayfarer said:

and immediately got called (or got slapped down as) 'a Vedantin' for saying it.

Malcolm wrote:

You said:

Wayfarer said:

But my approach to the 'nature of mind' is different, in that I say that mind is never 'an object of perception' - it is not 'out there' and can't be known as any kind of essence, substance, or in any objective sense. It is always the 'unknown knower, the unseen seer', which is a pre-Buddhist idea from the Upanisads.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, the clarity aspect of the mind can be taken as a direct object in meditation, this is the basic practice of Mahāmudra, Dzogchen, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 3rd, 2016 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Why is Nichiren Buddhism marginalized in the American Buddhist community?

Content:

dharmapdx said:

Thank you. What you write here is exactly the issue I am facing. I feel that I need an "organized curriculum," and I'm envious that other schools have exactly that.

Malcolm wrote:

Then, you should study in the Tendai school, using Nichiren's works as a modifying reference.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 3rd, 2016 at 8:50 AM

Title: Re: Nāda yoga ~ Sound as Path ~ Sutra,Tantra,Mantra,Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The point is to distinguish karmically arisen appearances from appearances of pristine consciousness.

florin said:

Isn't this distinction somewhat unnecessary ?

Malcolm wrote:

This distinction is the whole basis of Dzogchen teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 3rd, 2016 at 5:30 AM

Title: Re: Nāda yoga ~ Sound as Path ~ Sutra,Tantra,Mantra,Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The point is to distinguish karmically arisen appearances from appearances of pristine consciousness.

Panaesthesia said:

No, the point is to recognize the emptiness of all appearances...

Malcolm wrote:

Not going to argue with you about it. But it is as I have said. All appearances are empty. Some appearances arise from karma, some do not. In Dzogchen teachings, we work with the latter, including the sound of dharmatā, which is just a "sound" that arises from your own state, for example, the sound and sights that you hear and see in the bardo of dharmatā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, April 3rd, 2016 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Nāda yoga ~ Sound as Path ~ Sutra,Tantra,Mantra,Dzogchen

Content:

Panaesthesia said:

"Dharmata Swayambhu Nada"

Malcolm wrote:

This is Sanskrit, not Tibetan. Tibetan would be rang byung chos nyid sgra, dharmatā svayambhu śabda.

Panaesthesia said:

Thank you for the correction Malcolm. My lack of attention to details like that shows why I should stick to my own language and my own words!

"self-arising"

Malcolm wrote:

Self-arising, in Dzogchen teachings, means "arising from one's own state," rather than from "other."

Panaesthesia said:

Ok, it's not as clean as I would hope. Since there is no "one" to have "one's own state," the "arising immanently" sense of "autogenous" is a better description of what is experienced.

Thanks again, for taking the time.

Malcolm wrote:

Worries about language are at best a distraction. The point is to distinguish karmically arisen appearances from appearances of pristine consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: Why is Nichiren Buddhism marginalized in the American Buddhist community?

Content:

Queequeg said:

There is no organized curriculum, by any Nichiren groups AFAIK, that can provide an accessible and practical approach starting with basics through the higher levels of practice. Japan was so unstable in the 13th, 14th and 15th centuries and the Nichiren community immediately after Nichiren's passing more or less struggled. Nichiren's description of the Daimoku as an amulet tied around our necks really bore out. Through those centuries of turmoil, little survived except the Daimoku. We certainly lost the curriculum Nichiren taught which appears to have been heavily loaded with study of Zhiyi, Zhanran and Saicho, and without that foundation, I don't think you can really understand him.

At this point, the curriculum needs to be reconstructed. I don't see anyone in a position to do that. SGI is stuck and lost without Ikeda. Shoshu has gone back to being their closed off sect. Nichiren Shu, while pleasant and open does not seem to have the inspiration, content to be the managers of historic temples. To the extent that they've innovated practices, it seems to be in the direction of Japanese style asceticism. Everyone else seems like they are sleep walking through the performance of the traditional rites.

Malcolm wrote:

There is also no client base. In Japan, Nichiren Buddhism was very tied in with Japanese "shamanism." Nichiren priests played important community roles.

In America, everyone wants to be a practitioner.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 9:24 PM

Title: Re: Nāda yoga ~ Sound as Path ~ Sutra,Tantra,Mantra,Dzogchen

Content:

Panaesthesia said:

"Dharmata Swayambhu Nada"

Malcolm wrote:

This is Sanskrit, not Tibetan. Tibetan would be rang byung chos nyid sgra, dharmatā svayambhu śabda.

Panaesthesia said:

"self-arising"

Malcolm wrote:

Self-arising, in Dzogchen teachings, means "arising from one's own state," rather than from "other."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 8:54 PM

Title: Re: Re "The Rain of Nectar of the Mantras Which Pacify a Myriad of Diseases"

Content:

pemachophel said:

Thanks for the replies Loppon-la and Dharma sis Yudron. That's how I'll search for this tomorrow.

Malcolm wrote:

nad sna tshogs zhi ba'i sngags bdud rtsi'i char pa/
gsung 'bum/_mi pham rgya mtsho Volume 29 Pages 121 - 312 Open Access Work under CC-BY License. See TBRC License Policy for more information.

[http://www.tbrc.org/#library_work_ViewByOutline-](http://www.tbrc.org/#library_work_ViewByOutline-O1PD451591PD453352DB646812DB646821PD657051PD65720%7CW2DB16631)

O1PD451591PD453352DB646812DB646821PD657051PD65720%7CW2DB16631

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 8:31 PM

Title: Re: Dreloma decides 487 bce

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

The 2016 issue of Dreloma, the Drepung Library periodical has a thorough article on the correct date for Buddha's nirvana. It gives supporting evidence for and against the

Tibetan, Chinese, Sri Lankan dates. Using mainly the dates of kings of Ceylon and India, the author picks 487 BCE as most likely.

Western scholars picked this date some years ago, so it was interesting to see Sonam Morup compare all the estimates and side with the West.

Malcolm wrote:

Newest dates are 407 BCE, cf Gombrich, Cousins. This also is more in line with the accounts preserved in Dzogchen annals.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: what is "modernity" in contemporary Buddhist discourse?

Content:

Wayfarer said:

thanks! It was an amazing experience, doing that course in 2011-2012 - my only regret being that it didn't last 10 years instead of just two. At the time I had a very flexible employment arrangement, two days a week I would spend on Campus, working on my day-job from the student labs and then going to lectures and tutorials.

The Sydney University quadrangle.

Malcolm wrote:

You had it easy, my "masters" degree (slob dpon, ācarya) in Buddhist studies took 15 years to gain, and included a three year solitary retreat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: Following a new Lama

Content:

Justmeagain said:

In terms of Empowerments, can they be given en masse as we see HHDL and others have done in the past? Again, I can't see there being much opportunity to sit in front of someone like D Rinpoche for a HYT empowerment for example.

Malcolm wrote:

You have to become his student.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

cloudburst said:
impressive.

Malcolm wrote:

You will see when you read it. You also have to recall that the canonical translation of the Pramāṇavārttika was made by Sapan. Phya pa's system is interesting in its own right, but it is far afield from Dharmakīrti.

cloudburst said:
sounds good

both Chaba and Dharmakirti both assert provisional views, so I don't mind if they diverge from each other, we can take what is good from both.

Malcolm wrote:

After you read Sapan, you will not be so interested in Phya pa, or blo rigs, anymore.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 3:32 AM

Title: Re: Re "The Rain of Nectar of the Mantras Which Pacify a Myriad of Diseases"

Content:

pemachophel said:

Does anyone know who the spell the Tibetan title for this book by Ju Mipham? And/or does anyone know if it can be found at TBRC? I'd like to look at this text. I tried searching for it at TBRC and didn't have any luck since I'm not sure of the Tibetan word order and the Tibetan for the translator's "myriad."

Malcolm wrote:

It is probably the nad sngags 'bum.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

It's absurd to assert, as Sakya Pandita does, that names don't signify anything because Buddha said "Shariputra, all phenomena are mere name". Mere name and mere appearance are synonyms, so names do most definitely signify something.

conebeckham said:

Really? There are no "appearances" prior to naming? Are you certain?

Malcolm wrote:

It is a big problem with Gelug philosophy, pointed out already by Gorampa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 3:18 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

fckw said:

Interesting discussion here, thanks guys! (I'd love to hear a little more about Shaktism in comparison.)

Malcolm wrote:

The basis has an aspect of consciousness, as the Six Dimensions clearly states:

If that aspect of pristine consciousness did not exist,

it would not be any different than the physical matter of the four elements.

fckw said:

Just one question: You are aware probably, that such logic is not valid reasoning according to Western philosophical standards, right? In Western thought you of course cannot conclude from the premise "...did not exist..." to "...would not be any different than physical matter...". According to Western thought, if something did not exist, then it could not be either different or same as anything else that does exist. (Whether a non-existent thing is same or different from another non-existent thing is an open question.)

Malcolm wrote:

The passage means that if the basis isn't a consciousness, it would be inert, like the four elements.

What is the basis? Garab Dorje states in a commentary in the Vima Snying thig:

"The fundamental basis is the trio of essence, nature and compassion of each individual's vidyā."

We saw already that essence, nature and compassion are aspects of what is termed "pristine consciousness" aka ye shes or primordial wisdom.

I also want to point out, that though it may seem to some people that Dzogchen is proposing some temporal beginning to samsara and nirvana, this is really not the case. Dzogchen is not a cosmology. It is a phenomenology of bondage and liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 2:59 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

cloudburst said:

Whether or not it represents the system of Dharmakirti is a debate, not a fact.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it really is a fact.

cloudburst said:

impressive.

Malcolm wrote:

You will see when you read it. You also have to recall that the canonical translation of the Pramāṇavārttika was made by Sapan. Phya pa's system is interesting in its own right, but it is far afield from Dharmakīrti.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: Why is Nichiren Buddhism marginalized in the American Buddhist community?

Content:

Queequeg said:

Kosen Rufu was a massive goal, and at least in the 60's and 70's, even 80's, that was the actual goal of SGI. The teachings they spread were also radically, fire and brimstone Nichiren - in that any deviation from the Lotus Sutra, embodied for them in the Daimoku and Gohonzon, was an unacceptable compromise.

.

Malcolm wrote:

Don't forget the Nam/Namu internet war of the mid 90's.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: Why is Nichiren Buddhism marginalized in the American Buddhist community?

Content:

dharmapdx said:

But what do others here think?

Malcolm wrote:

The SGI I people I met back in the '80's always tried to convince me that I should chant for money and cars. Seriously.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 2:30 AM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:

cloudburst said:
Whether or not it represents the system of Dharmakirti is a debate, not a fact.

Malcolm wrote:
No, it really is a fact.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 1:54 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 said:
You view the gzhi like a Vedantic purusa.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, like brahman, or so it seems.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 1:54 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
I said the basis is a set of generic qualities of a given consciousness

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.

Malcolm wrote:

Dante, the term "basis" describes a state of nonrealization, nothing more.

We use the term to describe a set of qualities of what is termed "pristine consciousness." The basis is a consciousness, term "pristine consciousness, as the Six Dimensions states:

Because pristine consciousness has three aspects,
the basis is explained in different words.

The Sgra thal gyur states:

The pristine consciousness dwelling in its own essence
is inseparable in three modalities.

Further, the Illuminating Lamp commentary on Sgra thal gyur states
the pristine consciousness—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.

A rock in a garden is just a projection of a mind that does not recognize its own state.
This is very explicitly stated of inanimate objects — they are reified out of the five lights
from our nonrecognition of the five lights. For example, the Illuminating Lamp states:
The luminous aspect of delusion resulting from that is stirred by a subtle vāyu. Also, all
the previous lights are stirred and obscured, such that the light's own appearance grows
dimmer and dimmer. After it becomes impure, the latent appearances of earth, water,
fire, and air emerge and appear as subtle particles.

Etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

cloudburst said:

Sakya Pandita's pov is an interpretation of the original material, like any other
commentary. I sincerely doubt the publishing of the Treasury is going to be particularly

exciting in the way you suggest, as those who have confidence in Chaba's system will refute it in turn, as many Sakya scholars did back in the fifteenth century as they embraced the new presentation of Lama Tsongkhapa.

Malcolm wrote:
You'll see.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 1:14 AM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
but since you posit multiple minds, then you are positing a "universe" of minds.

Malcolm wrote:
And the problem is?

gad rgyangs said:
you seem to be fixated on reified minds. there are no minds, only mental events, and those of course are empty & clear. go and look for something that you are calling "mind" and when you find it, get back to me.

Malcolm wrote:
A mind is merely a label for an aggregate, just like "Dante" is a label for an aggregate. Please don't bore me with this trivia.

gad rgyangs said:
exactly. so you are singling out one particular label for an arbitrary aggregate: "mind", and calling the nature of that arbitrary label "the basis", meanwhile insisting that all other arbitrary labels of other aggregates are of things that "don't exist" (like the universe), and then you are insisting that there is a basis that inheres in your chosen aggregate-label, but not any other labels. That's why I am saying you are an inveterate mind-reifier.

Malcolm wrote:
I never said the universe didn't exist. I did not insist that basis inheres anywhere. I said the basis is a set of generic qualities of a given consciousness, the realization of which results in Buddhahood. It is really not hard to understand and is all perfectly consistent with Dzogchen texts and teachings. Shabkar writes:
Fortunate children of good families, listen without distraction:
although the discourses of the eighty-four thousand aggregates of Dharma and so on,
taught by all the victors of the three times,
are equal with space and immeasurable,

in reality, they were taught in order to realize one's own mind;
apart from this, nothing else was taught by the victors.

And:

All perceived appearances are the appearances of one's mind.

The outer world that appears to be inert is the mind.

The sentient beings inhabiting it appearing in six classes are also the mind.

The appearance of the happiness of the higher realms of gods and men is the mind.

The appearance of the suffering of the three lower realms is also the mind.

Avidyā appearing as the five poisons is also the mind.

Vidyā appearing as self-originated pristine consciousness is also the mind. [106]

Negative thoughts appearing as the traces of samsara are also the mind.

Positive thoughts appearing as buddhafi elds are also the mind.

The appearance of obstacles of ghosts and demons is also the mind.

The appearances of gods and siddhis are also the mind.

The appearances of the variety of concepts are also the mind.

Non-conceptuality, appearing as one-pointed meditation, is also the mind.

The signs and colors of things are also the mind.

The absence of signs and non-existence of proliferation is also the mind.

Appearances without the duality of being one or many is also the mind.

Appearances that are not established as being either existent or non-existent are also the mind.

There are no appearances at all apart from the mind.

And:

This relaxed unfabricated ordinary mind

is the vast space of the realization of the Jinas free from extremes.

Frankly, my friend, I think you are a little too hung up on words.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The universe does not exist outside the minds that project it,

gad rgyangs said:

but since you posit multiple minds, then you are positing a "universe" of minds.

Malcolm wrote:

And the problem is?

gad rgyangs said:

you seem to be fixated on reified minds. there are no minds, only mental events, and those of course are empty & clear. go and look for something that you are calling "mind" and when you find it, get back to me.

Malcolm wrote:

A mind is merely a label for an aggregate, just like "Dante" is a label for an aggregate. Please don't bore me with this trivia.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, April 2nd, 2016 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

yet he also says that through the experience of emptiness and clarity one may discover instant presence/rigpa. And discovering rigpa means, first the discovery of the inseparability of emptiness and clarity, not as experiences but as the nature of reality, and then, through that, the discovery of the basis, which, as he says, is the nature of both the individual and the universe.

Malcolm wrote:

The universe does not exist outside the minds that project it, and there is no inseparable clarity and emptiness for us to discover apart from the inseparable clarity and emptiness of our own minds. The fact that we can discover the knowledge of our own state through the three experiences proves that we are discovering the knowledge of the real state of our own minds, and nothing else. As far as the reality of the universe goes, well as Āryadeva put it, when one discovers the emptiness of one thing, one discovers the emptiness of all things, and as the Dzogchen tantras put it, knowing one thing liberates everything (gcig shes kun grol).

You should should also bear in mind that the experience of clarity, which is connected with lhun grub, is just an example, the same goes with the experience of emptiness, it is merely an example. This is why, for example, we don't attain the first bhumi at direct introduction (99.999 percent of us at any rate) — that only happens if one happens to be diligent enough to reach the third vision in this life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2016 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

conebeckham said:

Anyone translating that text, Malcolm?

Malcolm wrote:

It should be out from LTC somewhat soon.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, April 1st, 2016 at 10:16 PM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:
According to Lorig...

Malcolm wrote:
Yeah, Sakya Pandita demolished that. I don't know why the Gelugpas persist in using this clumsy Tibetan system invented at Sangphu that has nothing to do with Dharmakīrti.

Tsongkhapafan said:
Perhaps because it is not a Tibetan system because it comes from Dignaga and Dharmakīrti? I wasn't aware of Sapan's objection to it.

Malcolm wrote:
No, the system of Lorigs (blo rigs) used in Gelugpa was invented by a Tibetan scholar named Phya pa at Sangphu in the 12th century. He was one of Loppon Sonam Tsemo's academic professors. Sakya Pandita refutes Phya pa's system utterly in the chapter on blo in his tshad ma rigs gter. Since Sapan's rigs gter has not been published yet in English, very few people are aware of this. Once it is published, it will cause a stir, because thousands of people will realize that the blo rigs they have been taught be Gelug is just Tibetan fabrication, and does not represent the intention of Dharmakīrti.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, April 1st, 2016 at 10:08 PM
Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism
Content:

gad rgyangs said:
No, you are confusing the experience of emptiness (just a state of nonconceptuality) and an experience of clarity (which is not the same thing as luminosity) for inseparable clarity and emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:
so what you are saying is that when someone perceives emptiness and enters the first buhmi, they are not perceiving emptiness, just non-conceptuality?[/quote]

What I am saying is that the the term "experience of emptiness" refers to an experience of nonconceptuality, where one's mind seems empty of thoughts and concepts (actually there is still a very subtle stream of thoughts and concepts). It is not the same thing as realizing emptiness, a point which ChNN (since he seems to be the only authority you accept) has made repeatedly over the years.

Likewise, "the experience of clarity," as opposed to the clarity aspect of the nature of mind, refers to a heightened sense of awareness, where, as ChNN notes, Longchenpa describes being aware of things even though they are outside of his immediate audiovisual range, such as features of the mountains behind him and so on.

The experience of bliss, obviously, does not refer to the bliss of awakening, but rather pleasurable sensations, for example, during sexual intercourse.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2016 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Ngakpa Livelihood

Content:

maybay said:

You're not forced to deal with the dominant forces of the time.

Malcolm wrote:

Tell that the carpenter's union...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, April 1st, 2016 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Lukeinaz said:

I am still hung up on the water/pus/nectar. Malcolm would you agree the appearance of such substances is the result of each individuals karma?

Also, if you say they are all equally deluded what is actually there once the delusion ceases?

And for Tsongkhapa, is the water like a blank canvas awaiting one's designation?

Malcolm wrote:

As to your first question, these are indeed karmic appearances.

As to your second question, a buddha perceives only a display of pristine consciousness, so pristine consciousness or primordial wisdom is what is "actually" there once the delusion ceases.

This is old argument in Tibetan circles. What Tsongkhapa actually argues is that the posited liquid substance is validly divisible into six portions: molten iron, pus and blood, water as an environment, water as water, and water as nectar over which asuras and devas squabble, thus rendering all perception conventionally valid, not only in their own domain, but generally so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 7:00 PM

Title: Re: Following a new Lama

Content:

Justmeagain said:

Hi just following on from a previous thread. With the risk of sounding trite I am very much drawn to Dzongsar Rinpoche. Can one be a follower of a Lama without actually meeting him or receiving empowerment from him? I was initially initiated in the Gelug tradition but Dzongsar's teaching sing to me 😊

Malcolm wrote:

Only in the same sense you can follow someone on twitter or facebook.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 8:04 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.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you are confusing the experience of emptiness (just a state of nonconcepuality) and an experience of clarity (which is not the same thing as luminosity) for inseparable clarity and emptiness.

So I think you have not understood this point correctly at all. But please feel free to continue to understand things however you like.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 6:26 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That is all Dharma has to say about reality.

The rest of Dzogchen is an explanation about how minds are deluded, and how they

liberate themselves. That's it. The rest is all complicated details.

mirrormind said:

For a mind that is just empty and aware the experience of something separate and concrete like an individual being must be utterly fascinating and alluring.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, kicking the chain of dependent origination into high gear.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: The Negative Retributions of Guns

Content:

Queequeg said:

pardon my interruption, but if Vajrapani = Nyala Pema Duddul, that seems like a big deal and pretty relevant to my question. The exchange with Vajrapani becomes something quite different than a literal exchange like one would have with a friend at the cafe.

Malcolm wrote:

His experience is a dialogue with Vajrapani. But if we were there, we likely would not see Vajrapani ourselves. But he would.

Queequeg said:

I get that.

But, its not that there is Vajrapani, then NPD, as two separate and distinct entities. There's something more nuanced going on. Correct?

Is my conversation with you, if we were to talk by phone or over coffee or something, of the same nature?

Malcolm wrote:

It is like a dialogue of wisdom with mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: The Negative Retributions of Guns

Content:

Queequeg said:

pardon my interruption, but if Vajrapani = Nyala Pema Duddul, that seems like a big deal and pretty relevant to my question. The exchange with Vajrapani becomes something

quite different than a literal exchange like one would have with a friend at the cafe.

Malcolm wrote:

His experience is a dialogue with Vajrapani. But if we were there, we likely would not see Vajrapani ourselves. But he would.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 5:46 AM

Title: Re: The Negative Retributions of Guns

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Texts like this can lead to awakening. Dune never will.

Queequeg said:

sorry to press you because you didn't answer one of my questions.

Are you saying, in reading Dune or the Avatamsaka Sutra, the ideal approach is the same - to be absorbed in the story?

Likewise, Nyala Pema Dudul's writings are a product of jñāna because was a Buddha, for real.

I will take this under advisement.

Malcolm wrote:

When reading Avatamska, one enters a samadhi on the mind of the Buddha. Frank Herbert has buddhanature, but I don't think reading Dune results in samadhi that leads to awakening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so you are saying that all buddhism has to say about reality is that minds are aware and empty.

Malcolm wrote:

In so many word, yes. That is all Dharma has to say about reality.

The rest of Dzogchen is an explanation about how minds are deluded, and how they liberate themselves. That's it. The rest is all complicated details.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: The Negative Retributions of Guns

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no difference between Vajrapani's mind and Nyala Pema Duddul's mind. The idea that the latter is reporting the words of the former, is a mere convention for mortals, but is not how things actually are. There is a reason Dzogchen tantras begin, "Thus did I explain at one time..." and only later restart with a conventional, "Thus did I hear at one time..."

Sherab Dorje said:

There is no difference between Vajrapani's mind and anybody's mind, but know we are veering kind of off track, in which case one could say that all prophecies are the words of Bodhisattva.... or Buddha... or ...yogini or ad nauseum.

For the purposes of this discussion though it would probably be intelligent to stay with the convention that Vajrapani uttered the words and Nyala Pema Duddul wrote them down for us.

Malcolm wrote:

It was NPD's vision, don't think you can really say that it was outside the dimension of his realization, i.e., Vajrapani was a manifestation of his own awakened mind. The same thing goes for my teacher's [KDL] constant visions of Padmasambhava.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 4:21 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

There is no getting around it. The problem is animal agriculture typically causes far more death and destruction.

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969715303697>

Science of The Total Environment

Volume 536, 1 December 2015, Pages 419–431

"The consumption of animal-sourced food products by humans is one of the most powerful negative forces affecting the conservation of terrestrial ecosystems and biological diversity. Livestock production is the single largest driver of habitat loss"

dharmagoat said:

It is that simple really. If you care about sentient beings you minimize the amount of farmed meat you consume.

Malcolm wrote:

It really depends on how those animals are raised. I have seen many grass-fed operations in my region where soil has been restored by rotational grazing, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: The Negative Retributions of Guns

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Again you are making the same mistake: Vajrapani hit the home run, not Nyakla Pema Duddul. Nyakla Pema Duddul merely reported what Vajrapani stated.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no difference between Vajrapani's mind and Nyala Pema Duddul's mind. The idea that the latter is reporting the words of the former, is a mere convention for mortals, but is not how things actually are. There is a reason Dzogchen tantras begin, "Thus did I explain at one time..." and only later restart with a conventional, "Thus did I hear at one time..."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 4:12 AM

Title: Re: The Negative Retributions of Guns

Content:

Queequeg said:

I don't know how familiar you are with the Lotus Sutra...

Malcolm wrote:

Very familiar. Read it many times, in many versions.

My point is that the Lotus Sūtra is a product of jñāna. This immediately puts it in a different class than other things. Texts like this can lead to awakening. Dune never will.

Likewise, Nyala Pema Dudul's writings are a product of jñāna because was a Buddha, for real.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

According to Lorig...

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, Sakya Pandita demolished that. I don't know why the Gelugpas persist in using this clumsy Tibetan system invented at Sangphu that has nothing to do with Dharmakīrti.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 4:06 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

then what is the mereological relationship between the basis of my mind and the basis of your mind?

Malcolm wrote:

Does there have to be one?

gad rgyangs said:

you're the one positing multiple bases, so how do they relate to each other? or are you willing to just say "reality consists of a bunch of minds" and leave it at that?

Malcolm wrote:

No, not multiple bases, no more than there are multiple heats.

The basis, as we saw above, is just the dharmatā of one's own mind, just as heat is the dharmatā of fire. We don't say of emptiness for example, that there multiple emptinesses for multiple entities, we don't need to say that of the basis either when we understand that the basis is a generic set of attributes for all minds, just as emptiness is a generic attribute of phenomena. We speak of emptiness often without distinguishing whether we mean one emptiness or many emptinesses, because it is understood at the outset that there is no entity "emptiness" that needs to be spoken of in plural or singular terms. Likewise, we don't need to speak about the basis in plural or singular terms because we can understand at the outset the term "basis" refers to the dharmatā of the mind, and not some entity out of which minds arise, or in which they are somehow located. Likewise, we discuss fire in terms of heat, we don't say that fires have heats, we merely generically declare that all fires are hot.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: The Negative Retributions of Guns

Content:

Queequeg said:

I would point out, "interpretive space" is not the same as skepticism.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, but it is still very conceptual.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

then what is the mereological relationship between the basis of my mind and the basis of your mind?

Malcolm wrote:

Does there have to be one?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: The Negative Retributions of Guns

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That is a lot of intellectual jugglery. How do you keep all those balls in the air?

Queequeg said:

I'm not sure what you mean...

What's the difference in viewing the sutras (leaving aside tantras, because I have little familiarity with them) as accounts of legends and viewing them as not literally true, but not untrue, nonetheless?

QQ wrote: "I don't think a giant stupa actually, materially came out of the ground and floated up in the air while Shakyamuni was discoursing with disciples at Grdhakuta some eight years before his parinirvana. That does not mean to me that its an untrue story."

Malcolm wrote: "Mahāyāna sūtras are not history, no sūtras or tantras are. They are legends about people who lived 2500 years ago. However, the legendary though they may be, this does not mean they are not documents of events."

Are we saying something substantially different? I come around to a similar conclusion - "Such concerns just are not important."

If you ever meet such a person...

That would be wonderful.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that I don't go into an interpretive space. When I read "A great stupa floated up out of the ground," I feel a part of that space in which bodhisattvas and stupas billow out of the ground, I don't go into some space of removed skepticism.

When I read Dune however, it is different because Herbert, for all his virtue as an author, was not a buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 2:59 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Since the ultimate pervades them without any nature at all, it is contained within each individual consciousness.

this is very different from saying, as you do, that the ultimate is each individual consciousness

Malcolm wrote:

I never said that each individual consciousness was ultimate per se. The point is that the ultimate (inseparable luminosity and emptiness) is a generic attribute they all share, in the same way all fires share the generic attribute of heat, and so on, or that each and every entity is empty. As Candrakīrti points, all things have two natures, one relative, one ultimate. In Madhyamaka, the ultimate nature of each and everything is emptiness. This is true also in Dzogchen; but in Dzogchen, not only are all minds ultimately empty, they are also ultimately luminous. This inseparable luminosity and emptiness is given the name "one's unfabricated mind" by Vimalakīrti, or as Mipham puts it:

That basis is originally pure from the aspect of lacking any proliferation, and since it is not solely empty like space, its impartial clarity is naturally perfect without being delimited or falling into extremes. Since it is the source of the appearances of all samsara and nirvana, compassion is said to pervade everything. In the Dharma terminology of the Great Perfection, the pristine consciousness that is said to be three-fold.

Likewise, in the sūtras and tantras, it called "the dhātu" and "emptiness" from the aspect of the characteristic freedom from all kinds of proliferation that cannot be perceived at all. [4/a] From the aspect of intrinsically radiant (mdangs) clarity it is called "self-originated pristine consciousness." Since it does not change in aspect, it is called "original mind (sems)," "original mind (yid)," "naturally luminous mind," "the vajra of mind," "the vajra of space that pervades space" and so on. Even though there is an explanation with many different names, all of them are not different in meaning than dharmatā of the mind, the nondual dhātu and vidyā, or bodhicitta, the ultimate reality is like a vajra.

Therefore, since the so called "dharmadhātu" is not understood to be only empty, it is the emptiness that possesses the supreme of all aspects, whole and indivisible from luminosity. Though it is called "self-originated pristine consciousness," the subjective mind that realizes the emptiness of the duality, and of subject and object, does not know conditioned signs. It is also necessary to understand that such natural clarity does not have an iota of a sign that can be designated as conditioned.

The bodhicitta mentioned in the mind series of the Great Perfection, the dharmadhātu mentioned in the space series, the self-originated pristine consciousness mentioned in

the intimate instruction series, the dharmadhātu mentioned in the Prajñāpāramitā, the original mind mentioned in most of the mantra tantras and so on may have different names by virtue of their purposes, but since the meaning to understand is the pristine consciousness of that meaning which illustrates the union of knowing and emptiness, the reality of all phenomena, it is the original connate pristine consciousness. Since it is naturally settled dharmatā because it is not generated by the traces of transmigration's three appearances, it is called the great bliss that is free from all pain of transmigration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

"seeing that the display of the mind as your own state is called "rigpa."

all you need to do is remove the "of the mind" from this sentence, and it will be basically correct, although clearer would be "seeing the display as the display of the basis is called rigpa", with the understanding that, as ChNNR says, "the universal level, and the level of the individual, the two being essentially the same. If you realize yourself, you realize the nature of the universe"

Malcolm wrote:

There is no need to remove "mind" from the sentence, since rig pa is knowledge that a mind has, apart from which, no rig pa is possible. This is the reason why prajñā and vidyā are synonymous. For example, Vimalamitra in the Vima sNying thig, among the five definitions of vidyā, which are contextual, states first that vidyā is "a clear nonconceptual consciousness contaminated by many consciousnesses." The second type is the vidyā that appropriates the basis (meaning the body) existing in the body, generates consciousness, existing within its own clarity, also termed, "unripened vidyā." The third type of vidyā is the one that exists in the basis, defined as possessing three pristine consciousness of essence, nature and compassion. The fourth is defined as the vidyā of insight, vipaśyāna, having to do with the visions. The fifth is the vidyā of thögal, here meaning vidyā at the conclusion of the fourth vision.

In the end, all five of these are just means of talking about one's own mind and it's knowledge of its own state or lack thereof, since all five of these vidyās, Vimalamitra points, are essentially the same.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: The Negative Retributions of Guns

Content:

Queequeg said:

I see where you're going with that, but I'm not at all convinced that the Lotus Sutra is a record of an actual encounter with Shakyamuni.

Malcolm wrote:

Define "actual."

Queequeg said:

You know, pics or it didn't happen.

I don't think a giant stupa actually, materially came out of the ground and floated up in the air while Shakyamuni was discoursing with disciples at Grdhakuta some eight years before his parinirvana. That does not mean to me that its an untrue story.

The Lotus Sutra more or less says that its fiction if you read between the lines. The parables of the burning house, the rich man and poor son, the phantom city, the good doctor who sends word that he is dead, Shakyamuni who was born at Lumbini, awakened at Gaya, turned the Wheel at Sarnath, and passed at Kusinagara - he says its all upaya. It presents the Buddha as saying, everything is an expedient to bring you to awakening and make you equal to me.

Malcolm wrote:

That is a lot of intellectual jugglery. How do you keep all those balls in the air?

Look, Mahāyāna sūtras are not history, no sūtras or tantras are. They are legends about people who lived 2500 years ago. However, the legendary though they may be, this does not mean they are not documents of events.

One tantra states, "The single vajra word is heard differently by those of different capacities."

Nyala Pema Dudul was a buddha. If he says he chatted with Vajrapani, I believe him. Three of my teachers are tertons. One of them (now deceased) chatted with Guru Padmasambhava regularly as clearly as we are typing words on this board. If you ever meet such a person, worries about whether the scenario in the Lotus Sūtra, etc., happened or not will vanish. Such concerns just are not important.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

"minds" are imputations. the presence that makes the imputation "mind" is what rigpa knows/realizes/is.

Malcolm wrote:

"Rigpa" is just a mind that is undeluded concerning its own state. Apart from that, there is no other "rigpa."

You can put scare quotes around "mind" and make all kinds of distinctions in English around words you have not defined nor clarified; but the basic reality is this: Dzogchen teachings describe how sentient beings become deluded, and how to remedy that delusion with the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

"mind" is an imputation, a conceptual proliferation. the basis is neither since it is beyond all conceptual categories. seeing this directly is called rigpa.

Malcolm wrote:

No, seeing that the display of the mind as your own state is called "rigpa."

For example, how do "sense organs rise up from the basis" in the following citation from the sgra thal gyur?

since the buddhas did not become deluded,
the sense organs that rose up out of the basis
recognized the self-appearances as natureless

For that matter, how would one account for this citation as well?

In the basis, totally undifferentiated
and undefined,

consciousness is grasped as moving, vanishing,
and spreading out,
and holding taints through accumulation.

Moreover, we here have a citation from the commentary on the sgra thal gyur would adds more understanding:

In Ati, the pristine consciousness—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.

Again, the so called generic basis is set of qualities which all consciousnesses share.

Even when we get to defining sems, what does the sgra thal gyur say?

Sems enters the pure and impure
three realms, and also buddhahood.

The basis has an aspect of consciousness, as the Six Dimensions clearly states:

If that aspect of pristine consciousness did not exist,

it would not be any different than the physical matter of the four elements.

If it were the case that the basis was single entity, there could not be separation of samsara and nirvana. How can delusion be accounted for, which is the whole reason for

describing the basis? As Vimalamitra further states:

[D]elusion arises from the difference between the basis and the conscious aspect of the basis.

If the basis is some unitary entity, this conscious aspect would have to be unitary, etc., in the sense that it would there could be no diversity. But when it is understood that the basis is generic set of attributes of every consciousness, there are no contradictions which remain.

In other words, Dzogchen is describing a phenomenology of liberation and delusion, and the language around the so called "basis" is merely a starting point for discussing that which we are deluded about. What we are deluded about is the nature our own states, and apart from a stream of empty consciousness, there is no other state that is under discussion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 12:33 AM

Title: Re: The Negative Retributions of Guns

Content:

Queequeg said:

I see where you're going with that, but I'm not at all convinced that the Lotus Sutra is a record of an actual encounter with Shakyamuni.

Malcolm wrote:

Define "actual."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so luminosity is not the basis, rather emptiness and luminosity are qualities of the basis, which is itself empty of both those qualities, as well as all others, including existence and non existence.

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is just your mind. Not your thoughts, not its content, etc. It has three qualities, essence, nature, and compassion.

There is no basis apart from your mind, in its unfabricated, unmodified state. If this wasn't the case, your nonrecognition of the five lights would not result in samsara, and your recognition of the five lights would not result in buddhahood. But in any case, it is just your own mind and its characteristics we are discussing. These five lights are just

the result of the stirring of vāyu which is the internal movement of your own consciousness prior its self-recognition/nonrecognition.

Now, you don't have to accept the Dzogchen account of the basis and the arising of the basis, and that is just fine with me. But let's not pretend that Dzogchen has some other kind basis in mind than the one I have just described.

From the point of view of the potentiality of the basis, your own consciousness, the basis is luminosity; from the point of the essence of the basis, your own consciousness, the basis is emptiness free from extremes. This emptiness and luminosity are inseparable, and are the essence and nature of your own mind. This is all very clearly explained in Dzogchen texts, I am not sure why you have a problem with this.

Further, the basis is only called "the basis" because one has not realized this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: The Negative Retributions of Guns

Content:

Queequeg said:

That is interesting. From a Vajrayana perspective the only difference between a work of imaginative fiction like "Dune" and this encounter with Vajrapani is that one is "pure" and the other is not. I don't think Frank Herbert ever thought the world he conjured for Dune was anything other than fiction. Is that then the same for Nyakla Pema Düddül?

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is the difference between Dune and the Lotus Sūtra. One text was written by a buddha, the other by an ordinary person. You pick which is which.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 31st, 2016 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

if luminosity is empty then it is a dependent arising. Upon what causes and conditions does it arise?

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not the case. Why are you introducing two truths through back into the conversation?

Emptiness is unconditioned, so is luminosity. Conditioned/unconditioned, this is just a mental reification.

In any case, all fires are hot, all water is wet, all minds are empty and luminous. This is not a problem.

"There is no mind in the mind, but the nature (prakṛiti) of the mind is luminosity."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

then is luminosity a quality?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, just as emptiness is a quality: that is what the generic basis is, a set of qualities which inhere to all sentient beings.

It is not really that complicated. We say that minds are empty and luminous. When we analyze a given mind (for example, our own, since we cannot examine the minds of others), all we can discover is emptiness and luminosity. These are the irreducible facts that pertain to minds. The fact that minds are empty means they are free from extremes and not monadic, or even plural entities. The fact that they are luminous means that they are not inert, like rocks, etc. We don't need to discuss these things in terms of the two truths, because there is no separation between the two truths anyway.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: The Negative Retributions of Guns

Content:

Queequeg said:

Are these prophets actual prophets...

Malcolm wrote:

Nyala Pema Duddul was a fully awakened person, a buddha. One of the people in the 19th century who attained rainbow body, leaving behind only hair and nails.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: A Tale of Two (Not Two) Nagarjunas

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, Jundo.

There is no one, no two, and it goes without saying that nonarising never arose.

No panicked elephants to tame. There aren't even elephant tamers.

jundo cohen said:

Sorry, Malcolm. What you say is absolutely right, yet it is completely and utterly wrong.

This world is completely empty. This world is totally full.

Gassho, J

Malcolm wrote:

If you tell me I am wrong, you are praising me for being right. Guess I can't win.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so luminosity is a primary substance?

Malcolm wrote:

If it were, it would not be empty. It is for this reason that it is an error to say that the generic basis is only a naturally perfected (lhun grub, anabhogana) nature (rang bzhin, prakriti). If this were the case, Dzogchen would be Samkhya, basically.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: A Tale of Two (Not Two) Nagarjunas

Content:

jundo cohen said:

... and thus too reality in pristine consciousness is
birth and death,
coming and going,
knowing and not knowing,
bondage and liberation
... the realization of which is liberation
...for everything arises and never arises as one,
... as even non arising does not arise.

Buddha tames a panicked tusker.

Gassho, J

Malcolm wrote:

No, Jundo.

There is no one, no two, and it goes without saying that nonarising never arose.

No panicked elephants to tame. There aren't even elephant tamers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 11:30 PM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

i meant "what is the basis of present mind?"

Malcolm wrote:

Luminosity.

gad rgyangs said:

and what is the basis of luminosity?

Malcolm wrote:

Luminosity does not have a basis, per se. It is empty. This is the reason the generic basis is described as being originally pure and naturally perfected i.e. so called ka dag chen chen po, great original purity. All minds have these qualities. The emptiness of the mind is not a basis for error, but clarity is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

Vasana said:

I would just like to thank you for your Discussion thus far, Gad rgyangs, Malcolm & Krodha.

Lots to chew on, Please continue.

This thread "Alaya-vijnana it is shared or subjective storage?" has some useful contributions within the context of personal/trans-personal bases and the questioned legitimacy of a 'container universe'. Highlighting Malcolm's distinction between the Cittamatra and Dzogchen view in particular.

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?t=21104>

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as a transpersonal basis in any version of Buddhadharma (modern innovations and misinterpretations notwithstanding).

gad rgyangs said:

then you are claiming some kind of monadology, where there are multiple entities.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends a) on what you mean by monad b) entity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

then from what are all minds generated?

Malcolm wrote:

Who says minds have a beginning? There is no presentation in Dzogchen where it is asserted that minds have some ultimate origin.

gad rgyangs said:

i meant "what is the basis of present mind?"

Malcolm wrote:

Luminosity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: A Tale of Two (Not Two) Nagarjunas

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Getting back to Nagarjuna, perhaps that is what he was pointing to with all his fancy deconstructions.

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgārjuna was not pointing to anything in MMK. If you want to understand what Nāgārjuna was pointing to, you need to read the Praise to the Inconceivable (Acintyastava):

One who asserts dualities in pristine consciousness
such as birth and death,
coming and going,
or bondage and liberation,
does not know reality.
There is no arising from anywhere,
that is what nirvana is;
because of being similar to an illusory elephant,
in reality, peaceful from the start.
Even arising does not arise,
held to be just like an illusory elephant.
In the same way too everything arises,
or in reality, never arises.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: what is "modernity" in contemporary Buddhist discourse?

Content:

mikenz66 said:

Rather than focussing on the understanding of samsarae

Malcolm wrote:

As Nāgārjuna states, "These two, samsara and nirvana, do not exist. However, the thorough understanding of samsara is nirvana."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

Yes.

Malcolm wrote:

Then the perception of the snake is a valid cognition because it is a direct perception.

Jeff H said:

Not all direct perceptions are valid. Those that are valid are valid and mistaken. Those that are invalid are invalid and mistaken.

According to Tsongkhapa validity is determined by the three criteria:

1. Known to consciousness (could include invalid perceptions)
2. Not contradicted by conventional analysis (functions according to definition)
3. Not contradicted by ultimate analysis (if it exists ultimately it does not exist)

conventionally)

Snake on rope is contradicted by #2.

Malcolm wrote:

The point was to show the flaw in TKF's reasoning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

It's true that things do not exist in the way that they appear and are like dreams, but it's incorrect to say that all perceptions of beings in the six realms are delusions. If this were so, it would be impossible to attain liberation and enlightenment. Love and compassion for example are not true grasping minds therefore they are not delusions. If sentient beings did not exist at all in the way that a snake does not exist on the basis of a rope, wishing to attain enlightenment to liberate them permanently from suffering would be a delusion and so would enlightenment.

Basically, you've gone too far.

Malcolm wrote:

Are direct perceptions valid cognitions or not?

Tsongkhapafan said:

Yes.

Malcolm wrote:

Then the perception of the snake is a valid cognition because it is a direct perception.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

Vasana said:

I would just like to thank you for your Discussion thus far, Gad rgyangs, Malcolm & Krodha.

Lots to chew on, Please continue.

This thread "Alaya-vijnana it is shared or subjective storage?" has some useful

contributions within the context of personal/trans-personal bases and the questioned legitimacy of a 'container universe'. Highlighting Malcolm's distinction between the Cittamatra and Dzogchen view in particular.

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?t=21104>

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as a transpersonal basis in any version of Buddhadharma (modern innovations and misinterpretations notwithstanding).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 10:06 PM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and because there are so many difference appearances to so many difference minds (buddhas and sentient beings), the so called generic basis is just that, a generic set of qualities all minds have, but that does not mean there is a universal basis from which all minds are generated.

gad rgyangs said:

then from what are all minds generated?

Malcolm wrote:

Who says minds have a beginning? There is no presentation in Dzogchen where it is asserted that minds have some ultimate origin.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 10:45 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

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 some kind of multiple-choice solipsism.

Malcolm wrote:

What do you mean by "universe?" Are you asserting that rocks have rig pa ala Jax?

gad rgyangs said:

his words not mine, in CatWoL

of course rocks do not have rigpa (since they are not sentient) but they are appearances

of the basis, just like sentient beings are. if the basis is mind (as you said) and rocks appear to mind, then even if they are a mistaken imputation made on the five lights, its still the basis (appearing as your mind) making that imputation.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and because there are so many difference appearances to so many difference minds (buddhas and sentient beings), the so called generic basis is just that, a generic set of qualities all minds have, but that does not mean there is a universal basis from which all minds are generated.

When you read Dzogchen texts properly, and forgo all the bullshit that has been imputed upon them, one can understand these things very easily.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 9:34 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Matt J said:

I think what is confusing to some people is that all appearances are delusions. In other words, appearances are delusions appearing to deluded minds. However, while this is true, it is not the case that all delusions are the same, or at the same degree, which I think is part of Tsongkhapa's point. Mipham for one distinguishes between valid and invalid conventional cognition, and also various levels of pure vision--- accordingly, a human being's vision is more "pure" than a preta's, but still under the influence of delusion.

From the Beacon of Certainty:

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, no. You are not understanding Mipham's presentation of Gorampa's view correctly. Mipham is speaking from the POV of the human realm. Tsongkhapa argues on the other hand that water has essentially six "parts", such that each class of sentient beings' perception of a liquid substance is equally valid.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 9:31 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

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 some kind of multiple-choice solipsism.

Malcolm wrote:

What do you mean by "universe?" Are you asserting that rocks have rig pa ala Jax?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 9:28 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Dzogchen talks about the kun gzhi, but I don't think that is what Malcolm is referring to.

Malcolm wrote:

I am talking about the term spyi gzhi, which in Sanskrit would be something samanyasthana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 9:23 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you want to understand Dzogchen, then you have to understand that the basis is exactly what Vimalamitra says it is, i.e., pristine consciousness, luminosity, ordinary mind, etc. Otherwise, the basis is just a blank inert voidness. How can emptiness alone reify anything?

gad rgyangs said:

Of course, but when you say (earlier in the thread) "There is no universal basis in Dzogchen",

Malcolm wrote:

There is no universal basis, as such. There is however a generic basis, which has three characteristics: essence, nature and compassion. Just as all instances of water are generically limpid, clear and moist, likewise the basis for each and every sentient being is the trio of essence, nature and compassion. Put in the simplest terms, all sentient beings possess a consciousness which has the nature being empty and clear. When examined from the point of view of reducing this to the most essential point, the basis is just one's unfabricated mind, nothing more, nothing less.

The all-basis is of course the imputing ignorance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: what is "modernity" in contemporary Buddhist discourse?

Content:

Queequeg said:
Fair enough.

Malcolm wrote:

Incidentally, it is pointed out that the people who wrote the Kalacakra tantra clearly knew that Meru cosmology was symbolic. They weren't idiots and their math accurately adjusts the calendar for latitude (a big problem in Indian astronomy up to the 10th century). It could have hardly escaped their attention that according to Meru Cosmology, it is never possible for the sun and moon to be in the sky at the same time.

So too earlier scholars must have recognized this.

It did not prevent them from having a geocentric universe, however.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Ganacakras in Sarma

Content:

tingdzin said:

Bump Terma's question. Do we have Indian sources laying this requirement out? Is the requirement found in in root texts or biographies or what?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, we do have such Indian sources. Look in the Ganapuja texts by Dombhi Heuruka and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: A Tale of Two (Not Two) Nagarjunas

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Been reading it. Zen, like much of Buddhism, comes in many flavors, pure and mixed.

Gassho, J

Malcolm wrote:

Pretty sure Tibetan Chan was no less pure than Japanese Zen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 2:03 AM

Title: Re: A Tale of Two (Not Two) Nagarjunas

Content:
jundo cohen said:
It goes on from there ...

<https://web.stanford.edu/group/scbs/sztp3/translations/shobogenzo/translations/busho/translation.html>

Malcolm wrote:
Seems very straight-forward to me.
For example, the Chinese original text where it literally reads Bodhidharma faced a wall for 9 years, in the Tibetan translation of the same passage, the passage reads "faced reality." In explaining Chan to Tibetans, Chinese Chan masters often had to depoeetacize their texts to make them understandable to Tibetans. Studying Chan texts in Tibetan translation is illuminating because of the (invisible) oral commentary that was required to make often multivalent passages in Chinese comprehensible to non-Chinese speakers, and it gives us a sense of use of how colloquial passages that are hard to understand were understood at that time.

I suggest you pick up a copy of Tibetan Zen.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 1:54 AM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:
Matt J said:
Are they? I thought the "lower" forms had more obscurations which is why they suffered more.

Malcolm wrote:
On the other hand, as I pointed out above; a human's perception of water seems deluded to a preta; likewise a preta's perception of pus and blood seems deluded to a human. From the point of view of a Buddha, the perceptions of pretas and humans are equally deluded.
It is not the case that a preta's perception of pus and blood in the preta realm is a delusion. A human perception of water in the preta realm is deluded since no water exists there, even conventionally.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 1:52 AM
Title: Re: what is "modernity" in contemporary Buddhist discourse?
Content:

Queequeg said:

But, if I figure out the genetic basis for why a cell gets switched into a cancer cell, haven't I superseded the general observation that cancer is a cell gone haywire?

Malcolm wrote:
Not at all.

Queequeg said:
Certainly does not invalidate the knowledge, but its certainly superseded.

Malcolm wrote:
No, because cells still go haywire, and treatments don't really change much. People were using chemo therapy for cancer a thousand years ago.

Queequeg said:
If I have a satellite image of the Indian subcontinent, hasn't this superseded Meru cosmology, and also kind of proven ideas about the world being a flat disc as wrong?

Again, its the biases that are problematic.

Malcolm wrote:
it just means you have a better picture, it does not mean that the basic facts described by Meru cosmology have changed (India as Jambudvipa, south of a square mountainous plateau region with many rivers and valleys, Africa to the west, Australia to the east, oceans, and so on.)

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 1:44 AM
Title: Re: A Tale of Two (Not Two) Nagarjunas
Content:
jundo cohen said:
It goes on from there ...

<https://web.stanford.edu/group/scbs/sztp3/translations/shobogenzo/translations/busho/translation.html>

Malcolm wrote:
Seems very straight-forward to me.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 1:06 AM
Title: Re: what is "modernity" in contemporary Buddhist discourse?
Content:
Queequeg said:
I don't understand setting up, say for instance, Ancient Indian Medicine against Modern

Medicine in antagonistic positions. Part of the problem is that the methods of developing knowledge might not be compatible, but that's as you describe, myopia, the bias against "tradition" DGA brought up.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that people in this thread keep on using modern medical and scientific conventions as if they somehow supersede or invalidate earlier knowledge. Meru cosmology was certainly abstracted by Indians, but the basic facts of the Meru cosmology are quite evident in an Indocentric view of the world. Especially given that name Ptolemy uses for the blond and red-headed horse people of the Central Asia step land, and the Meru cosmological name for the northern continent, inhabited by such horse riding people is the same, i.e. Kurus.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: A Tale of Two (Not Two) Nagarjunas

Content:

jundo cohen said:

There is nothing in any of his writing which could be considered "straight analysis" of doctrines. He was always poetical, abstract, playful to bring out facets.

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, I really don't agree with this based on my reading of Dogen, albeit in translation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: A Tale of Two (Not Two) Nagarjunas

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Not so sure about that — he still maintained the primacy of the Lotus Sutra as the best of all sūtras.

jundo cohen said:

Ah, but his approach to the Lotus Sutra is a prime example of just what we are talking about. Dogen bent and unbent, re-wilding the already wild Lotus Sutra in order to explore all its facets in a less than "straight" way ...

Taigen Dan Leighton

Dōgen's Appropriation of Lotus Sutra Ground and Space

The Lotus Sutra is prominent among the many sources quoted by Dōgen in his writings, highlighting the Mahāyāna context of his teachings and worldview.

In this paper I focus on Dōgen's use of the pivotal story in Lotus Sutra chapters fifteen and sixteen—the myriad bodhisattvas emerging from underground and the inconceivable life-span of the Buddha—to express his own worldview of earth, space, and time as enlightening forces. The shift in perspective expressed in this sutra story reflects a fundamental shift in East Asian Buddhist soteriology. A close reading of Dōgen's references to this story discloses how his hermeneutical play with its imagery of ground, space, and emptiness expresses immediate awakening, beyond stages of cultivation; he cites the inconceivable life-span story as an encouragement to present practice.

...

A full investigation of the roles of metaphor, polysemy, and intertextuality in Dōgen's writing would be illuminating, but is far beyond the scope of this essay. However, Dōgen's use of metaphor as applied to "ground," "underneath," and "space" may be somewhat clarified by some of Paul Ricoeur's discussion of metaphor. Ricoeur says, "The understanding of a work taken as a whole gives the key to metaphor.... The hermeneutical circle encompasses in its spiral both the apprehension of projected worlds and the advance of self-understanding in the presence of these new worlds" (Ricoeur 1982, p. 272). Dōgen's playful interpretations of the world of the Lotus Sutra certainly express a pre-understanding of a "projected world," and also a self-understanding, or rather, Dōgen's particular understanding of the inner nature of self itself, from his Buddhist perspective. His interpretive play with the world of the Lotus Sutra, in turn, further informs and explicates the world of Dharma and practice he is expressing.

<https://nirc.nanzan-u.ac.jp/nfile/2862>

Malcolm wrote:

Leighton is reading a lot of things into Dogen. Part of my problem with Po-mo is exactly the kind of silliness Leighton involves himself in above re Ricouer.

What I was referring to was his simple, and not unexpected, declaration that the basic scripture of the Tendai Sect is for him, primary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: what is "modernity" in contemporary Buddhist discourse?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

They understood that...

Queequeg said:

That is some fascinating stuff. How did they come to this knowledge? That's really interesting stuff.

Malcolm wrote:

They had ample opportunity to examine people with grave wounds, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: what is "modernity" in contemporary Buddhist discourse?

Content:

Queequeg said:

No, you're still missing my point.

Sign and signified - "Impermanence" is something we can talk about - its a concept, a descriptive of how things are. The actual reality, is beyond words, concepts - it can only be known/realized, etc.

We've had this discussion before and it went around in the same circles.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps, in the end, my view is more practical, less intellectual and less abstract.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 30th, 2016 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: A Tale of Two (Not Two) Nagarjunas

Content:

jundo cohen said:

I believe the point made by David Loy is that it need not be strictly analytical, and analytical is only one way to approach, penetrate and express the MMK.

Malcolm wrote:

Re David Loy, CCL. I don't regard him as a serious scholar. He more like a media pundit, AFAIC. Too sloppy by far for my taste, conflating Buddhist and nonBuddhist concepts of nonduality and so on.

jundo cohen said:

Don't forget that as his personal path, Dogen seemingly rejected for himself that philosophical tradition of the Tendai.

Malcolm wrote:

Not so sure about that — he still maintained the primacy of the Lotus Sutra as the best of all sūtras.

I think he left Mt. Hiei because he could not find a Chan teacher there. So he went and found one in China.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2016 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: A Tale of Two (Not Two) Nagarjunas

Content:

jundo cohen said:

What is more, in the case of Nagarjuna...

Gassho, J

Malcolm wrote:

The MMK is strictly analytical. One should consult his collection of praises for a more "poetic" presentation of Mahāyāna. Dogen certainly would have learned about the three treatises school in China which focused on Madhyamaka while he was begin educated at Hiei-zan.

Beautiful place. I formally converted to Buddhadharma on the spot while listening to a crowd of Japanese people chanting Hanya Shinkyo in the rain, led by a Tendai priest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2016 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: what is "modernity" in contemporary Buddhist discourse?

Content:

Queequeg said:

That's some claim. Not defending anyone's myopia, but, to claim that Ancient Indian Medical Science (more appropriate to talk about Ancient Indian Doctors) knew what modern cancer researchers do now is a tough claim to make. Not saying its not true, but I don't see it.

Malcolm wrote:

They understood that cancer was a disease in which certain cells of of the body run wild. They did not understand DNA sequencing, of course. Nor did they understand genetic switches. Cancer in general however was also much more rare than it is today. But they understood the disease in general and its many secondary causes. I study this for a living. The study and practice of Tibetan medicine is part of my livelihood. The chapters on brain injuries, injuries to the limbs, etc., are really quite remarkable for their modernity. Modern Surgery was invented by Sushruta roughly around the first century AD. His textbook on surgery (Sushruta Samhita) is also truly amazing and the implements he invented, shapes and all, are used to this day by surgeons around the world.

Queequeg said:

No, they don't change at all. All conditioned phenomena are still impermanent; all afflictive phenomena are still suffering; all phenomena (conditioned and conditioned) are still not self; nirvana is still peaceful.

What you are stating are more or less abstract principles. The understanding of impermanence is a wholly subjective thing, and is necessarily different from person to person, because the subjective nexus is different.

Malcolm wrote:

No, impermanence is not subjective at all.

Queequeg said:

I'm not disagreeing with you, but I'm focusing on what this means for each being, which, to me, lies at the heart of this question of modernity.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess we will have to make a safe space for people with a "subjective" understanding of impermanence, and help them pretend that the very cells in their bodies are not perishing at colossal rates, that the earth does not turn, that the seasons do not change, and that there is no birth, aging, illness and death.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2016 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: what is "modernity" in contemporary Buddhist discourse?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

For example, one can certainly argue that reforms allowing greater access and equality for women, and greater opportunities for practice and exposure to the teachings by lay people, allow for the first time a majority of Buddhist sentient beings to have opportunities to awaken that they were de facto denied for millenia. This is so even though allowing such a role to women and lay folks often flies in the face of traditional ways. The women and lay folks were pretty much denied the opportunity even to ask those "existential questions", let alone engage in serious practice for solution.

Malcolm wrote:

This has nothing to do with the core existential questions posed by Buddhadharma.

jundo cohen said:

One could argue that a modern understanding will remove some traditional beliefs that perhaps distract from the path to awakening.

Malcolm wrote:

The issues is not traditional beliefs (which ones specifically?).

jundo cohen said:

One could argue (and I know many will disagree strongly) that an understanding of modern brain science, human psychology and the like will actually make many of our traditional practices more effective and efficient.

Malcolm wrote:

Psychology is a gross pseudoscience.

There is some advancement in the understanding of the human brain, in terms of a finer grained understand of the relationship between sense cognitions, parts of the brain and so on, but not as much as many people ignorant of the history of medical science outside Europe would like to believe.

jundo cohen said:

I believe that many of the same existential questions that drove ancient Indians or Chinese are what drive us today. Perhaps there are more sentient beings today, practicing Buddhism more seriously and with better information about it, than any time in history.

Malcolm wrote:

Census-wise, there are far less, actually. Buddhadharm is dying. Buddhadharm used to be the largest religion in the world, it is now fourth and slipping.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2016 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: what is "modernity" in contemporary Buddhist discourse?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

the existential questions which drive it have not changed.

Queequeg said:

Indeed. I get old, sick, and die.

But how these things are understood and experienced does change - at least superficially. The cancer spreading in my body I understand to be my own cells gone haywire. Dementia is the cells in my brain degenerating and breaking down inside my skull. Pain I feel is nerve endings being stimulated. Etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing here that was not known to Ancient Indian Medical Science, though modern Western Scientific historical myopia would have you think otherwise.

Queequeg said:

Taking the body of scientific knowledge we presently have, does the approach to those

Buddhist existential questions change? They do because, we can't get out of our present circumstances, so the path will have to lead from here.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they don't change at all. All conditioned phenomena are still impermanent; all afflictive phenomena are still suffering; all phenomena (conditioned and conditioned) are still not self; nirvana is still peaceful.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2016 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: what is "modernity" in contemporary Buddhist discourse?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Some ways will rely on traditional beliefs and assumptions more, even if modern science and understanding seem to point elsewhere. Others will reject such beliefs, turning instead to a Buddhism more informed by modern worldviews. (At one extreme, for example, there may still be those who seem Mt. Sumeru and traditional views of cosmology as how this world is physically organized, while others will come to see it as but helpful metaphor or simply some which can be done without).

Malcolm wrote:

There are several cosmologies taught in sūtra and tantra. Thus we can presume that cosmologies are something relative, which are in accordance with the relative perception of the karmic vision of sentient beings.

The goals of Buddhist practice and the existential questions which drive it have not changed. Frankly, if you don't ask the right question, you will not get the right answer, and this true also of Buddhadharma. I would argue that Buddhist modernism fails to recognize the existential questions that have driven people's motivation for practice for the past 2500 years, and seeks to replace the existential questions that drove Buddha to awaken with existential questions that won't lead anyone to awaken.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2016 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Wayfarer said:

Here's a hypothetical: is there any difference between bogus and real? Like, bogus cures, bogus spiritual teachers, counterfeit bills, and such - are the bogus copies, and the real copies, just the same?

I would say, obviously not - therefore that the difference between bogus and real is real, or something that exists.

Yes or no?

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally, there is a difference between a perception of one moon in the sky, and two. The former is true, the latter is false. However, both cognitions are the same insofar as they are both false cognitions with respect to reality.

On the other hand, as I pointed out above; a human's perception of water seems deluded to a preta; likewise a preta's perception of pus and blood seems deluded to a human. From the point of view of a Buddha, the perceptions of pretas and humans are equally deluded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2016 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

you cannot connect "basis" to "something" using "is" unless the "something" neither exists nor does not exist. This qualification certainly does apply to "mind", but but it also applies to everything else. So, if you are willing to say "the basis is one's own unfabricated mind" then you can just as well say "the basis is the willow tree in the courtyard". Otherwise, you are reifying "mind" and it is game over.

Malcolm wrote:

Complain to Vimalamitra, it is his statement, not mine.

gad rgyangs said:

do you agree with his statement? If so, how do you answer my critique? No quotations please, I would prefer if you spoke from your own understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course I agree with his statement. If you want to understand Dzogchen, then you have to understand that the basis is exactly what Vimalamitra says it is, i.e., pristine consciousness, luminosity, ordinary mind, etc. Otherwise, the basis is just a blank invert voidness. How can emptiness alone reify anything?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2016 at 11:21 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The basis [gzhi, sthana] is one's own unfabricated mind which is originally pure, i.e.,

empty. The all-basis (kun gzhi, ālaya) in Dzogchen refers to the aspect of mind which gathers traces.

gad rgyangs said:

you cannot connect "basis" to "something" using "is" unless the "something" neither exists nor does not exist. This qualification certainly does apply to "mind", but but it also applies to everything else. So, if you are willing to say "the basis is one's own unfabricated mind" then you can just as well say "the basis is the willow tree in the courtyard". Otherwise, you are reifying "mind" and it is game over.

Malcolm wrote:

Complain to Vimalamitra, it is his statement, not mine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 29th, 2016 at 10:05 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But in reality, the perceptions of the beings of the six realms are just delusions, from top to bottom.

Tsongkhapa said:

It's true that things do not exist in the way that they appear and are like dreams, but it's incorrect to say that all perceptions of beings in the six realms are delusions. If this were so, it would be impossible to attain liberation and enlightenment. Love and compassion for example are not true grasping minds therefore they are not delusions. If sentient beings did not exist at all in the way that a snake does not exist on the basis of a rope, wishing to attain enlightenment to liberate them permanently from suffering would be a delusion and so would enlightenment.

Basically, you've gone too far.

Malcolm wrote:

Are direct perceptions valid cognitions or not?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

As to rebirth, my position is that Dogen believed in rebirth and spoke of it, as would be expected of a Buddhist teacher of the 13th century. Such was the world view of the time.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know, Jundo. He harshes out on people who reject rebirth in the Shobogenzo because, according to him, to reject rebirth is to reject and destroy the Buddha's teaching of the four kinds of āryas: stream entrants, once-returners, never-returners and arhats, and thus reject the Buddha's model of liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

Saoshun said:

The view you explained may be true for tantra or closer to tantra rather to dzogchen view, or I'm wrong?

Malcolm wrote:

What I explained above is precisely Dzogchen view coming from the eleven topics of the intimate instruction series.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Oh, how I knew that was coming! Saw that a mile away.

It is one demonstration of the marvelous Siddhi power of being able to foresee the future that I have developed as a Zen Master.

Gassho, J

Malcolm wrote:

If you had an ounce of kindness, you would humor me and play a game of chess, a conventional one. I am white. You are black.

jundo cohen said:

I really don't play, can't even remember what all the pieces do at this point. Happy to try Shogi or (my daughter's favorite) "Babanuki" (like old maid, but even here a few important Japanese twists) ...

https://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?id=355967011172756&story_fbid=579379058831549

Gassho, J

Malcolm wrote:

That is ok, jundo, you can ask anyone for help if you are not sure. Surely you are empty enough to give it a go, there are no losers or winners, its just a game iof chess.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 10:39 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

King's pawn to e4.

jundo cohen said:

Oh, how I knew that was coming! Saw that a mile away.

It is one demonstration of the marvelous Siddi power of being able to foresee the future that I have developed as a Zen Master.

Gassho, J

Malcolm wrote:

If you had an ounce of kindness, you would humor me and play a game of chess, a conventional one. I am white. You are black.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 10:37 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Wayfarer said:

delusion only exists relative to reality. If everything is delusion, nothing is.

Malcolm wrote:

When one does not see delusion for what it is, than one is deluded. When one sees delusion for what it is, than one is awake. If one believes that any of this is more than a dream or an illusion, one is definitely deluded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 10:25 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Anyway, thank you to all who have debated with me to this point in the thread. I did not expect it to go long thought so many pages, and so many opinions and standpoints (and standless standpoints) expressed. Our different approaches, styles, ways of

communicating and points of view have been made clear through this debate, I feel.

I hope we have come to some mutual understanding of the beauty of each others' ways and how we express those beliefs. This vast boundless world has a place for all.

May we all hold sincere beliefs, express them honestly, but speak them gently to each other honoring the other fellows' doubts and beliefs otherwise.

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:
King's pawn to e4.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 9:38 AM

Title: Re: Ganacakras in Sarma

Content:

tingdzin said:

A question which I believe can be easily answered without breaking anyone's samaya of secrecy:

In the Nyingmapa tradition, meat and alcohol are usually considered indispensable for tsok offerings, whatever else may be offered. (I know about the exceptions, and I am not referring to the ingredients of mendrup, and this is NOT a question to be hijacked by the great vegetarian debate). My only questions are whether this is true also in the Sarmapa traditions, and if so, does anyone know how far back the custom can be traced?

Malcolm wrote:

It is definitely true in Sakya.

Back to India.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 8:55 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Wayfarer said:

If everything is delusion, and nothing is real, then that describes exactly the meaning of the term 'nihilism', i.e. nothing being real.

Malcolm wrote:

When one understands that everything is a delusion, one can relax, feel at ease, and be available to help others. It may sound counterintuitive to you, but it makes perfect

sense to me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 6:35 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

Saoshun said:

Not really. Rigpa is not changed by any modification of prana nor it's less visible by lack of those.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it is, this is how rig pa becomes ma rig pa.

Saoshun said:

No, it's not. Marigpa was created as carrot for a mule to point out non existence of ma rigpa really. It's creating ignorance and enlightenment to realize that there is no really ignorance at all. It's like creating contrast, I not sure if I can put it proper in the word to show what I mean, but ma rigpa is non existent as only means to stop and look.

Malcolm wrote:

My friend, I can assure you that is indeed the case that rig pa becomes ma rig pa. And why? Because vāyu stirred consciousness and that consciousness that does not recognize its own display is ma rig pa. As it states in my forthcoming translation (Wisdom, 12/16) of one of the most seminal of all Dzogchen commentaries:

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

And how does this happen?

The trio of the essence, nature, and compassion of the original basis becomes the three ignorances. Since the essence is made the cause of delusion, it is designated “the ignorance of the same identity” and becomes so. Once the nature is made the condition of delusion, since the vāyu of the impelling karma manifests as color, it is designated “the connate ignorance” and becomes so. Compassion is made the result of delusion. Since pristine consciousness manifests as different names, that is designated as “the imputing ignorance” and becomes so. As such, from not recognizing that knowledge and ignorance have the same cause, like the front and back of one’s hand, the ignorance of the same identical cause arises from not arriving at ultimate nonduality. The connate ignorance (arising from the preceding) is a term of duality, meaning as soon as the conceit “this is originally pure” occurs, it is inseparable from that ignorance. Thus, ignorance depends on knowledge and delusion depends on nondelusion.

And as Vimalamitra states:

The vidyā that is moved and stirred by vāyu
is subtle; its stirring is difficult to understand.

You might wish to reconsider your point of view in this light.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Lukeinaz said:

So this is it? 19 pages later and you don't know if you are dreaming..

Malcolm wrote:

Relative truth is a delusion. What is the point in making a distinction between levels of delusion? For you, the delusion that this liquid is water is true; and a preta's delusion that it is pus and blood is false. For a preta, its delusion that this liquid substance is pus and blood is true; and your delusion it is water is false.

But in reality, the perceptions of the beings of the six realms are just delusions, from top to bottom.

Lukeinaz said:

Man you are fast! You also answered nicely the question I was going to ask after deleting my first post. False relative truth. Is that like seeing a snake on the rope?

Thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

The snake is one delusion, the rope is another, the strands of the rope, yet one more, and so it goes, like an onion without a core.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Jeff H said:

Malcolm, can you explain how that is different than what Gelugpas say? That is what I understand Tsongkhapa to mean -- except that I think he says "appearances cannot be denied" is what is meant by conventional existence.

Malcolm wrote:

We don't make much of a distinction between waking and dreaming, false relative truth and correct relative truth. The latter distinction, especially from the point of view of Dzogchen, are largely unimportant.

Lukeinaz said:

So this is it? 19 pages later and you don't know if you are dreaming..

Malcolm wrote:

Relative truth is a delusion. What is the point in making a distinction between levels of delusion? For you, the delusion that this liquid is water is true; and a preta's delusion that it is pus and blood is false. For a preta, its delusion that this liquid substance is pus and blood is true; and your delusion it is water is false.

But in reality, the perceptions of the beings of the six realms are just delusions, from top to bottom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Bakmoon said:

No one takes it up as an affirmative position, but texts do point out that phenomena don't exist, and they also aren't non-existent. Obviously taking that up as a view is a mistake but I don't think just saying the words is a problem.

Malcolm wrote:

The best way to present the view of non-Gelugpas is to state that we see things as med par gsal snang, i.e. non-existent clear appearances: non-existent, because when analyzed they cannot be found; clear, because appearances cannot be denied.

Jeff H said:

Malcolm, can you explain how that is different than what Gelugpas say? That is what I understand Tsongkhapa to mean -- except that I think he says "appearances cannot be denied" is what is meant by conventional existence.

Malcolm wrote:

We don't make much of a distinction between waking and dreaming, false relative truth and correct relative truth. The latter distinction, especially from the point of view of Dzogchen, are largely unimportant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Bakmoon said:

They don't say that dependent arisings are totally non-existent though, they just say that they are neither existent nor non-existent, and are functioning illusory appearances.

Malcolm wrote:

No one says this, because this is the third extreme.

Bakmoon said:

No one takes it up as an affirmative position, but texts do point out that phenomena don't exist, and they also aren't non-existent. Obviously taking that up as a view is a mistake but I don't think just saying the words is a problem.

Malcolm wrote:

The best way to present the view of non-Gelugpas is to state that we see things as med par gsal snang, i.e. non-existent clear appearances: non-existent, because when analyzed they cannot be found; clear, because appearances cannot be denied.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Bakmoon said:

They don't say that dependent arisings are totally non-existent though, they just say that they are neither existent nor non-existent, and are functioning illusory appearances.

Malcolm wrote:

No one says this, because this is the third extreme.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: Gradual enlightenment

Content:

rachmiel said:

Secondly, assuming what you say is true, why is it that almost every enlightenment experience you read about is of the orgasmic flash of total understanding variety?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, for one thing, it isn't. Tibetan biographies are not filled with this sort of thing, but usually just simply note, "during this retreat X realized X" and move on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Jeff H said:

And by contrast, doesn't Svatantrika refute self-nature in the ultimate and yet insist that any phenomenon must have some conventional inherency which is only considered

existent once a valid cognizer correctly labels it?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. All Bhavaviveka says is that in the refutation of an opponent's position, a consequence is insufficient to convince them of emptiness. They must be shown that emptiness is provable through a formal syllogism which destroys their position. Candrakirti disagrees, and asserts that a mere consequence is sufficient.

There are other things for which Candrakirtī (and later Tsongkhapa and many others) criticize Bhavaviveka, but they are inconsequential to his main point.

In other words, Tsongkhapa's Svatantra is not represented by Bhavaviveka. His Svatantra is just as idealized a school as his Prasanga. Neither idealized position exists in Indian Madhyamaka in the manner in which Tibetans since the 12th century have presented it.

It has taken some time for scholarly consensus to grapple with this, but it has gradually come around. In brief, Tsongkhapa's Madhyamaka is his own. Brilliant, unique, and scholarly, but it is not a Madhyamaka that is recognizable in any Indian school. In fact it represents a rapprochement of Madhyamaka dialects with a species of Buddhist logic invented in Tibet by Phyapa at Sangphu (a famous opponent of Candra and the formulator of the system of logic employed in Gelugpa).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 2:11 AM

Title: Re: Gradual enlightenment

Content:

rachmiel said:

Again: Can enlightenment be a low-key gradual dawning-on without any explosive high-key kensho/satori Aha! experience?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. Generally, this is how it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I just treat clergy like people. Unless they get uppity.

jundo cohen said:

I will try to follow your example from now on as a model of humility and reticence.

By the way, you can search the archives of Dharma Wheel up and down, and I don't

believe I have every called anyone "uppity." That doesn't seem like right speech.

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't call anyone uppity either, but when clergy get too big for their britches, well, you figure it out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

conebeckham said:

Explain the second bit of your post, please. How am I a Svatantrika? This is an important distinction for anyone wishing to undersand Tsongkhapa, you know?

Herbie said:

If you believe to know what I think or know then you are actually taking your own imputation of "Herbie's knowledge" as being mine which you can only do if you take your imputation as inherently existing.

Bakmoon said:

So using inference to find out what other people think makes you a Svatantrika?

Malcolm wrote:

If this is case, then Candrakirti is an Svatantrika because he clearly invokes inference in the Madhyamakāvatara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I just treat clergy like people. Unless they get uppity.

jundo cohen said:

I will try to follow your example from now on as a model of humility.

Malcolm wrote:

You often talk about what needs to change, what should be kept, etc.

Personally, I think the whole monastic thing is on its last legs, and westerners who aspire to it are deluding themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Gradual enlightenment

Content:

rachmiel said:

Thank you, everyone. I suspect that awakening comes to different people in different ways.

So are there recognized awakened ones that have never had the explosive Aha! type of enlightenment experience?

I ask because it seems like it's a "calling card" of (alleged) Enlightened-ati: To have (and often share publicly) a dramatic enlightenment experience. In certain groups I hang out with, having experienced a life-changing "transformation" or "discontinuity" is a prerequisite to be taken seriously.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I don't take the Adyashanti/Loach Kelley/Mooji/Benito/Neo-advaita crowd very seriously.

First you figure out what awakening is. Then you set about realizing it. Then you continue in that state.

It is all very low key, no drama. Drama is for storybooks and hagiographies, usually overemphasized to make a point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

To be perfectly frank with you, it really seems otherwise.

jundo cohen said:

As I always say, treat all clergy alike

Malcolm wrote:

I just treat clergy like people. Unless they get uppity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

There are many "modern" Buddhism(s) and many "traditional" Buddhism(s) developed by people in varied places over the millenia. But in general, "modern" means to me Buddhism which breaks traditions in ways heavily influenced by modern outlooks such as, for example, allowing women equality with men despite past restrictions, greater emphasis on actual lay practice (as opposed to a role as primarily a source of Dana for Merit), and a greater willingness to challenge, reject or revise stories, teachings and doctrine due to a modern understanding of historical events or how the physical universe works.

Malcolm wrote:

This is already accounted for in Buddhist teachings through the distinction between provisional and definitive teachings.

jundo cohen said:

I don't expect anyone to believe what I say because I have some title...

Malcolm wrote:

To be perfectly frank with you, it really seems otherwise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

No! Consensus does not overrule the rights of minorities to peaceful and non-violent beliefs within a religion, especially in a Pan-Buddhist group, I believe.

Malcolm wrote:

Bucking the consensus earns you the dubious privilege of being ignored and irrelevant.

Furthermore, when someone does ask me to explain something in Vajrayāna, if there is something I cannot express, I will be honest and direct about it, "I cannot explain this to you." I certainly do not badger people with insider rhetoric and then deride them for not understanding it, a pattern all too common in your posts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Even more boring are posts written by people who rely on their supposed authority or

ordinations to bolster their opinions. Not that you care, but my preference is tightly argued and brief posts with as few citations as necessary and only when necessary. Oh man. You can search up and down in the archives of Dharma Wheel and I would never call someone's Ordination "supposed".

Malcolm wrote:

I did not call anyone's ordination "supposed." I question it when people use their supposed authority (as scholars, what have you), or their ordinations (bhikshus, Zen preists, Ngakpas, etc.), to bolster their authority. Please read more carefully and be less reactive. Thanks.

For example, no where have I ever insisted that anyone listen to me because I have the benefit of expertise in Tibetan, have done a solitary three and 1/2 year retreat, and have been awarded an Ācarya (slop dpon) degree in Tibetan Buddhism as well as a degree in Tibetan Medicine. People listen to me because they have decided they agree with me. The people who do not listen to me have decided not to listen to me because they do not agree with me. But I would never insist that someone had to agree with me because of my credentials.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Gradual enlightenment

Content:

rachmiel said:

Does Buddhism also allow for gradual enlightenment? More like a slow dawning upon rather than a sudden flash.

Malcolm wrote:

It rather depends on what you mean by awakening. Awakening itself is the first moment of the so called ārya or noble path. This is then followed by a gradual eradication of the two kinds of obscuration. Prior to this moment of awakening, one is trying to realize the union of emptiness and compassion. When that is realized, one has awoken.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 28th, 2016 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

No, I do not believe in throwing the baby out with the bathwater.

Malcolm wrote:

You were the one who invoked the definition of superstition, not I.

jundo cohen said:

It will be in the eye of the beholder which doctrines are keepers, and which are outdated or inaccurate.

Malcolm wrote:

The point, which really seems to escape you, is that we all already know this. This is the essence of studying tenet systems for example, where it is understood that Vaibhashika is superior to Pudgalavada, Sautrantika superior to Vaibhashika, Yogacara superior to Sautrantika, and Madhyamaka the supreme intent of Buddha's common Mahāyāna teachings.

However, there is such also thing as community consensus, and on such issues as rebirth, the existence of three kāyas and so on, the career of the bodhisattvas, there is here too a general consensus. For example, there is a consensus among Japanese Buddhists that their ordinands are monks. However, there is a wider consensus that they have not fit the bill as such for some centuries, and definitely not since the Meiji era. I don't pretend to be expert at negotiating these differing consensuses, but then I don't have to be. For example, there maybe a consensus among Vajrayāna Buddhists that the only path to awakening in a single lifetime, from soup to nuts, is highest yoga tantra, but in conversations with people who do not share that consensus, I don't discuss it at all. What would be the point? So I don't bring it up.

jundo cohen said:

Further, many doctrines and beliefs which may be inaccurate based on their original premise can be retained for other reasons. For example, I no longer believe that the "Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch" represents the accurate and actual words of the Sixth Patriarch "Hui-neng", if such a person in that capacity actually existed at all. Scholars have produced very strong, redundant and convincing evidence that the work was written later, is largely fiction, possibly as a bit of inter-sect politics.

Malcolm wrote:

Your example is not an example of doctrine or belief. Is there something the Platform Sūtra you dispute or find archaic, apart from dismissing its author and his hagiography as legendary and not historical?

jundo cohen said:

Jundo does not like to discuss, he likes to hold forth, lecture and scold.

Thank you. I will try not do, and instead to be more like you in the future.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this would be wise. Long posts are a bore to read, in general. Even more boring are posts written by people who rely on their supposed authority or ordinations to bolster their opinions. Not that you care, but my preference is tightly argued and brief posts with as few citations as necessary and only when necessary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2016 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

I just caution followers against what may be (please have an open mind!) superstition, blind faith, ancient ignorance, misguided imaginings, myth taken as history, baseless magic and delusions posing as "Teachings" which have little to do with the core path. Please have an open mind that perhaps some of those "inner realizations" are the creative dreams and hallucinations of the mind.

Malcolm wrote:

The above contradicts what you state here:

And in doing so, I will continue never to attack or demean any School, Teacher or other individual who believes otherwise.

Basically, the link you provided can be applied even to anything you might identify as "core teachings of the Buddha." Under the definition you provided, all religious and philosophical discourse is superstition. All of it. Including every single word you have written about Buddhism, Zen or otherwise. Hoisted on your own pitard, wot?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2016 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

DGA said:

Jundo, is this a topic you would like to discuss?

Malcolm wrote:

Jundo does not like to discuss, he likes to hold forth, lecture and scold.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2016 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

Saoshun said:

Not really. Rigpa is not changed by any modification of prana nor it's less visible by lack of those.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it is, this is how rig pa becomes ma rig pa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2016 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: Two teachers, two different answers

Content:

davcuts said:

All I know is it would be nice to know I'm not going to spend eons in hell.

Malcolm wrote:

HHDL already said that you were blameless many times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2016 at 4:52 AM

Title: Re: Two teachers, two different answers

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Dave, you did just fine.

davcuts said:

Several years ago I was in a bad place. I sent emails to two teachers asking them for help and advice. The question I asked them was regarding samaya. I wanted to know if I had broke mine. I had been in a cult which left me devastated. I won't name the cult because of TOS of Dharmawheel. As a result I spoke out against the cult and its teacher. I created a group called the Survivors for former members of the cult. The group became a success and in September of last year His Holiness the Dalai Lama met with Survivors and even invited them to attend his teachings in India this year. I have received a lot of thanks from people over the years for creating the group. One man even thanked me for saving his marriage. When I first created the Survivors group I wasn't sure if I did the right thing. We after all where being critical of our former teacher. So when I asked for advice I was surprised to get two different answers. One teacher told me it was the wrong thing to do, and I did break my samaya. He went so far to suggest the result will be hell for me when I die. The other teacher on the other hand said I did nothing wrong. The teacher from the cult I was in had broken his samaya with His Holiness the Dalai Lama and had been expelled from his university. According to the second teacher I had no samaya to break. I have struggled with this for several years and would like to know how others feel about it. Did I do the wrong thing by creating the group? Just in case I did send a letter to my former teacher and begged his forgiveness for speaking so harshly about him. I would like to get past this but I really don't know enough about samaya to know which teacher is correct. So any help would be appreciated.

Thanks,

David

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2016 at 4:37 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

David N. Snyder said:

Heidi Cruz has a Masters degree from a university in Belgium and also an MBA from Harvard. She is a highly accomplished woman, regardless of what you might think of Ted Cruz and his policies.

Tenso said:

Though, let us not kid ourselves here. Most men would give away their left testicle to be with a woman like Ivanka. Can't really say the same about Heidi no matter how accomplished she is.

Malcolm wrote:

Most men are dumbasses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2016 at 3:32 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If there was something or someone of interest to me to comment on, I would, without hesitation. The person making a huge fuss here about posting in forums where we "don't belong" isn't me.

jundo cohen said:

So, is the policy that I can go into any section of Dharma Wheel and "set you guys straight" (not that I would, and certainly not that you guys would see me as "setting you straight"?) That is not what I was told several times about how this place works. I was told to stay in the Zen Section or here because people consider my criticism and skepticism of certain doctrines and historical claims as "attacks" on their beliefs and schools. I never intend my opinions to be an attack on anyone.

Anyway, even if I could go in, I would just not go into the Tibetan or Nichiren sections and "set people straight" (not that they would see it that way). WHY? I do not meddle with people's beliefs, but celebrate them and let each person be. It would not happen. I have no interest (or expectation) of "setting anybody straight" and, furthermore, my "straight" is crooked to someone else, their "straight" is crooked to me. May we each and all walk our own straight and crooked paths.

Anyway, that is a side issue ... forget I mentioned it.

Gassho, J

Malcolm wrote:

I am not a moderator here, and have no influence over what they do. Years and years ago I was asked if I would like to be a mod, and I said no. So, I don't set policies, have no influence. I just post and that is about it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2016 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For practical purpose, I will post where ever I please.

jundo cohen said:

You can search high and low in the Dharma Wheel Archives, and I have never said such a thing about my doing so.

But don't you think possibly that your tone might strike some as a little "bullyish"? Do you go into the Nichiren section and set them straight with your wisdom too?

(Actually, seems like maybe you sometimes do?)

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=59&t=19530&p=290900&hilit=malcolm#p290900>

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, that is not a post by me there, it is a reference to someone issuing a challenge to make rain. But I have no posts in that thread.

If there was something or someone of interest to me to comment on, I would, without hesitation. The person making a huge fuss here about posting in forums where we "don't belong" isn't me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2016 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

I get it Jundo: while proclaiming yourself to be free of boundaries, in fact, you really like boundaries.

I like boundaryless-boundaries and boundaried-boundarylesses. Don't you get that

about me by now?

However, for practical purposes, I believe the Nichiren folks should have a little corner to do their Nichiren stuff without be going in to teach them about my "boundaryless-boundaries". No? The Dharma Wheel is so big, give them a little private room.

Malcolm wrote:

For practical purposes, I will post where ever I please.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2016 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Starting here, you began defending the Zen forum as if it was your personal fiefdom:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=69&t=22153&start=60#p327930>

Things degenerated from there.

jundo cohen said:

I believe that the Nichiren folks should have one little Nichiren corner to talk Nichiren stuff among themselves, address Nichiren interpretations and practices without me running in there to set them straight, explain their purported "mistakes" from my Zenny eyes etc. In a pan Buddhist Forum, that is the purpose of a subforum dedicated to a school, is it not?

If we want to discuss, compare, correct and criticize each others' Traditions we have this "Open Dharma" etc. No?

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:

I get it Jundo: while proclaiming yourself to be free of boundaries, in fact, you really like boundaries.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 27th, 2016 at 1:29 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For example, in the ordinary buddha thread, I was having a pleasant dialogue with Astus, as we are wont to do, and have done now from time to time over these many years, in

many different forums, from Zen to Tibetan Buddhism and everything in between. We never have a problem with each other, and were going along just fine until you butted in. Sure, you can butt in all you like, but your butting in was a stentorian,

jundo cohen said:

Thank you, Mr. Kid Gloves. Soft Tones and Gentle Opinions.

Malcolm wrote:

You must have me confused with someone else.

jundo cohen said:

Yes, I disagreed with you and Astus on some opinions regarding Zen teaching and practices which I felt to be partial or incorrect in the Zen Forum, and I explained my reasons. I never resorted to angry pejorative, ad hominem, said that you were not entitled to your opinion. I voiced my opinions in a discussion of Zen in which I found you had things wrong. (Oh, and I have never been inside a Tibetan Buddhist thread ever that I can recall. In fact, I don't think that I have ever commented on Tibetan Buddhism ever except to say something meant to be ecumenical like "people should respect and honor our funky beliefs who do not practice our funky beliefs, people should respect and honor your funky beliefs who do not practice your funky beliefs")

Malcolm wrote:

Starting here, you began defending the Zen forum as if it was your personal fiefdom:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=69&t=22153&start=60#p327930>

Things degenerated from there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

I have scolded and berated people for failure to develop the ability to engage in calm and mutually tolerant discourse in which our differences in beliefs, teachings and approaches are recognized and honored.

Malcolm wrote:

Jundo, I suggest you get a mirror and look in it. In other words, you are ignoring the log in your eye while focusing on the splinter in the eyes of others.

For example, in the ordinary buddha thread, I was having a pleasant dialogue with Astus, as we are wont to do, and have done now from time to time over these many years, in

many different forums, from Zen to Tibetan Buddhism and everything in between. We never have a problem with each other, and were going along just fine until you butted in. Sure, you can butt in all you like, but your butting in was a stentorian, "WARNING WARNING WARNING this is the ZEN FORUM, please STEP AWAY from the car," like this guy:

In a word, lighten up. Jealously defending your turf while claiming to be free of boundaries is..., well, you fill in the blank. And for the record I don[t care in what forums you post.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

I am playing Shogi while you play chess. Thus the lack of communication.

Malcolm wrote:

Jundo,

You keep on holding up more than one finger, meaning you are the one who is unwilling to communicate. This is amply demonstrated by your posts.

jundo cohen said:

And the fact that you have not sat in a Zendo since 1978 and that others here have only passing familiarity shows in your lack of familiarity with Zen doctrine and approaches to Practice (I know you will deny that, but someone who left because it did not speak to them cannot then speak to the practice of those for whom it does resonate and who "got it" and stayed.).

Malcolm wrote:

I did not leave "Zen," I went to a Zen weekend retreat as part of a course in high school on Buddhism and Taoism. I was 16. Your assumptions are pretty funny.

jundo cohen said:

You and some others around here should learn to do the same.

Malcolm wrote:

You love being a scold.

jundo cohen said:

By the way, you can search the entire archives of Dharma Wheel, any and all posts by me ever here recently or years ago AND YOU WILL NEVER EVER FIND ONE CRITICAL OR INSULTING COMMENT BY ME REGARDING ANYONE ELSE's religious sect, teacher or their beliefs. Never, nothing like that, not one. Nothing Zip Nada. You will never find one.

Malcolm wrote:

Sigh, this is just not true, but I don't have the energy to trot them all out to you again.

jundo cohen said:

Jundo has not put forth any proposition he wished to debate.

Not true. I did! I put forth the proposition that cannot be put forth nor taken away. Yes or no?

Malcolm wrote:

Jundo, you have used this thread as scold to berate others, while claiming immunity from the same.

White King's pawn to e4.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

maybay said:

I thought we were going to have a debate.

Malcolm wrote:

Jundo has not put forth any proposition he wished to debate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You already disqualified yourself from the discussion, namely: "I am neither a Gelug follower nor a buddhist..."

Herbie said:

Well then ... if this is your legitimation for being disruptive in the Gelug forum then I have already learned something important about another aspect of Tibetan buddhists.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not being disruptive at all. Debate is a time honored tradition in Tibetan Buddhism. Trust me, in debate courts in Tibet, they don't have signs saying, "Only Gelugs allowed."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

You know, I have not actually played chess in 30 years.

Malcolm wrote:

That's ok, I have not sat in a Zendo since 1978. (that's not completely true, I went to one in 1988, but to hear a Shingon priest, not to sit Zazen).

White King's pawn to e4.

jundo cohen said:

Chess or shogi, both beautiful games though the rules differ.

Malcolm wrote:

You initially posted a picture of a small boy taking on chess masters. So, while I sure shogi is fun, we are playing chess.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

heart said:

To me it seems like you are the main irrational "we vs they" poster in this thread.

Herbie said:

Hmh ... I am one and I am neither a Gelug follower nor a buddhist but I am interested in a philosophy which has been developed in buddhist context, namely Tsongkhapa's Prasangika.

heart said:

Malcolm questions everything, in any tradition, that doesn't accord to his own thinking. Everyone that been on this forum knows this. Surprise, he don't agree with everything Tsongkhapa said.

Herbie said:

Well but I understand that this is the Gelug section of this forum, not a general section, and that this is the place to learn the meaning of Tsongkhapa's philosophy. I think that this should be respected and not disrupted.

Malcolm wrote:

You already disqualified yourself from the discussion, namely: "I am neither a Gelug follower nor a buddhist..."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 9:17 PM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

But the Buddhboard without boundaries or win and lose, One Piece holding all Pieces, each movement still and still movement, is True too. No birth or death, no north south east west, nothing to gain and never a loss possible.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, King's pawn to e4 (since you ceded white already by asking others to go first).

jundo cohen said:

Your technique

Malcolm wrote:

There is no technique here, Jundo. Just a simple game of chess. White King's pawn to e4. e4.jpg (11.95 KiB) Viewed 136 times

Oh, and I am still holding up one finger. How many you are holding up?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

But the Buddhboard without boundaries or win and lose, One Piece holding all Pieces, each movement still and still movement, is True too. No birth or death, no north south east west, nothing to gain and never a loss possible.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, King's pawn to e4 (since you ceded white already by asking others to go

first).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 7:06 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Too many people let their anger at Trump himself (legitimate, he's disgusting) distract from the bigger picture: the political setup that created him. His supporters might be wrong, but they have real grievances, and people like Brooks have been living in la la land for so long, it comes as a shock to them.

frankc said:

You just called another sentient being disgusting.

Are there any Anti Trump people here that can provide a quote of a single "disgusting" thing he has ever said?

Malcolm wrote:

His call for torturing muslims, his depicting Mexicans as rapists, etc, you name it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 9:42 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

11108870_10207811098409266_840563682120970064_n.jpg (55.02 KiB) Viewed 1472 times

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 9:31 AM

Title: Re: Extremist Buddhism / Bad Press Buddhism

Content:

Bhikkhu_YinRi said:

Has anyone heard of any Extremist Buddhists?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, in Tibet, Myanmar and Shri Lanka

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 9:28 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

You may think I am ducking...

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed you are. King's pawn to e4.

I am still holding up one finger. How many are you holding up? (No, this is not a Zen question, I would not even attempt it.)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 8:23 AM

Title: Re: Bodhisattvabhumi (Tsadra) Hardcover – March 8, 2016 by Asanga (Author), Artemus B. Engle (Translator)

Content:

Nicholas Weeks said:

Malcolm,

Have my copy now and already am quibbling. On the page before the Introduction is a Tibetan verse from Je Rinpoche that mentions Buddha, Ajita and Asanga. The last line translates as "I pray for blessings to these three..."

Who or what would send blessings to those three? Should the 'to' be 'of' or 'from'?

Malcolm wrote:

He might have worded it a little better, "I pray to these three for blessings..."

A seriously minor quibble.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am holding up one finger. How many are you holding up?

jundo cohen said:

Which finger is that?

Malcolm wrote:

It does not matter which finger it is, but the sake of discussion, my index finger.

Now then, how many fingers are you holding up?

King's pawn to e4.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 2:39 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

You see, perhaps you are a prisoner of your own mind. You don't see that the board is boundless, and you have great freedom to make this game.

Malcolm wrote:

King's pawn to e4. Perhaps you are a prisoner of your own expectations.

jundo cohen said:

Malcolm, seriously answer my question: What would a chess board with no boundaries, no squares, one Piece Peace Buddha that moves freely and covers all positions at once look like? How can you win? What would be captured?

(Seriously, answer these questions. Can you?)

You seem tongue tied to answer. Try.

Gassho, J

Malcolm wrote:

Jundo, you are not paying attention. I did answer your question.

jundo cohen said:

It would not be chess, and it would not be a game.

Malcolm wrote:

I am holding up one finger. How many are you holding up?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

You see, perhaps you are a prisoner of your own mind. You don't see that the board is boundless, and you have great freedom to make this game.

Malcolm wrote:

King's pawn to e4. Perhaps you are a prisoner of your own expectations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Malcolm, seriously answer my question: What would a chess board with no boundaries, no squares, one Piece Peace Buddha that moves freely and covers all positions at once look like? How can you win? What would be captured?

Malcolm wrote:

It would not be chess, and it would not be a game. King's pawn to e4.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

PS - Malcome knows that the safest driving is never to take the car out of the garage.

Malcolm wrote:

It's Malcolm, not Malcome.

Yes, you seemed to have digested that lesson, nevertheless, King's pawn to e4. My car is out of the garage, now it's your turn.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Jundo, you need to move some pieces out of the way before you can move a rook, like

the rook's pawn or a knight.

jundo cohen said:
Not with the Buddha's chess set!

Malcolm wrote:
King's pawn to e4.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 1:20 AM
Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)
Content:
jundo cohen said:
Rook to i9.

Is that the best ya got?

Malcolm wrote:
Jundo, you need to move some pieces out of the way before you can move a rook, like the rook's pawn or a knight.

dharmagoat said:
Not this rook, it has transcended the chessboard.

Malcolm wrote:
If you want to play chess, you have to play by the rules. Similarly, if you want to debate, there are also rules.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 1:04 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!

My head rests on the chopping block. Give er a shot. I say it can't be cut in two.

Open to any Buddhist topic or any topic, the sky is the limit.

Gassho, J

PS - Near bedtime here in Japan, but I will check back in the morning.

Malcolm wrote:
King's pawn to e4

jundo cohen said:
Rook to i9.

Is that the best ya got?

Gassho, J

Malcolm wrote:
Jundo, you need to move some pieces out of the way before you can move a rook, like the rook's pawn or a knight.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, March 26th, 2016 at 12:50 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!

My head rests on the chopping block. Give er a shot. I say it can't be cut in two.

Open to any Buddhist topic or any topic, the sky is the limit.

Gassho, J

PS - Near bedtime here in Japan, but I will check back in the morning.

Malcolm wrote:
King's pawn to e4

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, March 25th, 2016 at 10:43 PM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016
Content:

Queequeg said:
And where do I suggest these things should not be considered? This is implicit in my comment. My point is, right now, the United States is a ridiculously armed actor that is itself enthralled in fear. Letting another 9-11 type attack happen would do nothing to break this cycle of violence here and abroad.

Malcolm wrote:

We can't really prevent another major attack without resorting to draconian and fascist policies. Ala, the surveillance state in which we live now.

Queequeg said:

We need pacification so that we can get our bearings as a country.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, so let's inflict more violence. That has worked so well so far.

Queequeg said:

When you say "we should start by...", certainly you don't mean that we should be dropping all the other rational efforts demanded by the exigencies of the moment. We should definitely be pushing back against the neo-con agenda, but we also can't stand by doing nothing while states around us fail, and Honduras is by objective measures, failing.

Malcolm wrote:

We should not be meddling in the affairs of other nations at all.

Queequeg said:

Europe is getting flooded with migrants because states in the middle east and Africa are failing; the US is flooded with migrants because states in Latin America are failing. The reasons are many, but you can't deny what's happening, and we have to deal.

Malcolm wrote:

US is hardly being flooded with illegal migrants. Illegal immigration has been a net 0 for some years.

Queequeg said:

BTW, there is no "restraining" these neo-con/neo liberal voices. That is not how we do things, at least if we want to still be American in the best sense of that handle. Our fellow Americans are woefully uneducated, uninformed. That is where we need to start if we want to "restrain" these other voices.

Malcolm wrote:

By restrain, I mean legislatively, in the sense of not voting for their policies and candidates.

Queequeg said:

Sure. But as is implicit in your comment, you still need to address the symptoms.

Malcolm wrote:

Treating people like human beings, rather than as "others" is the place to start.

Queequeg said:

As for getting at this cause... that book they fetishize is a problem. Only their own clerics can address its interpretation. We, of course, could present our own views and convince them that their book fills their heads with wrong views... that would require engagement that I'm not convinced almost anyone is interested in, aside from atheists who just push their shallow materialism and gentle nihilism. Seems to me, some folks, maybe the type who congregate around this watercooler, might ought to feel compelled to do a little more about these wrong views.

Malcolm wrote:

We don't need to do that at all. Koranic interpretation is complex. We can, from a theoretical point of view, consider their religion "wrong view." But that is not our business.

But really what we need to sell them on is that liberal democratic values will help them maximize their potential as people. This is what most of the 3.2 million Muslims in the US understand, and the reason why they are here. And we need to stop messing with the Middle East, stop supplying Israel with money until they agree to a two state solution, etc.

Queequeg said:

Nope. Just an observation there are people who seem to be uninterested in rooting out wrong views.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, it is not our business. We need to be more open and less racist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2016 at 9:59 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

Sorry for any confusion - I am not saying that a valid mind depends upon a valid object and vice-versa. What determines whether an object is valid or not is the cognizer that apprehends it. Mind is primary. What I meant was, there is no mind without an object and no object without a mind, thus they mutually depend upon each other; you cannot have one without the other, otherwise mind would inherently exist as the Chittamatrins assert because it wouldn't depend on anything.

Malcolm wrote:

They don't assert this.

Tsongkhapa said:

Although it is true that dreams, awarenesses and gross waking minds do not differ in the sense that the dream is a mere appearance to the dreaming mind and the waking world is a mere appearance to the gross waking mind, we cannot say that the consciousness of living beings is wholly invalid when compared with the consciousness of a Buddha. Chandrakirti says that anything imputed by worldly people in dependence upon a valid name - should be realized without investigation to be existent in just the same way as they are spoken of by worldly people.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a big caveat there, "without investigation."

Tsongkhapa said:

Buddha accepted all these things just as worldly people impute them. He would never argue with worldly people about what they realize with their valid cognizers.

Malcolm wrote:

It would be like telling a person in a dream that they are merely having a dream. It only works after they have woken up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2016 at 9:47 PM

Title: Re: Compassion practice in Zen

Content:

jundo cohen said:

but I sometimes wonder if the present emphasis on "Compassion" and "Loving Kindness" and such in its present form is truly how such were taught in Asia...

Malcolm wrote:

In Tibet, most definitely. We have volumes and volumes written about it. It is an integral part of the extensive training in bodhicitta found in the Kadampa school's mind training.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2016 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

It's true that there is nothing there that makes it a functioning chair. It exists and functions because it is merely imputed by a valid mind. As you say, a hallucination is not a functioning thing but a non-existent, however the hallucinating mind is a

functioning thing - it functions to confuse and to fool us into believing that a chair exists where it does not.

Malcolm wrote:

Which all entails that you believe chairs have some separate existence apart from our imputation of "chair" on some mental appearance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2016 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: Let's Debate! :-)

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Note to Moderators: Please give this thread a chance, as I promise you that it will remain peaceful, pleasant, mutually respectful and informative on my part by me, and I know by everyone involved as well. Let's see what happens, just for frolic and coming to appreciate our varied ways! I assure you that this is going to be something quite powerful and beneficial for mutual understanding.

It was suggested that some folks would like to debate, your beliefs and Zen doctrines (at least through my lips). Why not? It might be good. So, please debate me. Nothing to lose. Whatever happens, okay by me.

I will let any of you pick the subject, state your premises and argue your case. Then I will respond. You can pick any point or topic you wish within Buddhism (or, for that matter, any matter). I am game.

There are only two rules: Remain civil, comrades in the Dharma. Gentle language, let us treat each other with respect. Second, do not discuss or debate among yourselves. You are all playing against only me, the Soto Zen guy, like in one of those group chess matches. You can make the first move. Anything you like. I am open to any subject, and I assure you that I will be very serious and sincere in my responses.

I predict we will all be left better for this.

I know that there was a famous debate in Lhasa a few years ago. Who won that one seems to depend, say scholars, on who you ask and which version you read. Maybe this one too?

https://books.google.co.jp/books?id=CJ8DCwAAQBAJ&pg=PT33&lpg=PT33&dq=tibetan+zen+debate+won+version&source=bl&ots=2wLDd4RJxR&sig=2lzGDQ2UhTTFiwdQ17ih_or0bqM&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi39evU79vLAhWFdKYKHWl3C0oQ6AEIKTAC#v=onepage&q=tibetan%20zen%20debate%20won%20version&f=false

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:
King's pawn to e4.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, March 25th, 2016 at 9:07 PM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:
You're talking nonsense Malcolm. Of course there is a difference between a conventional truth and a delusion. A conventional truth is an object of a valid mind and exists and functions, a hallucination cannot; you can't actually sit on a hallucination of a chair because it's not an object of a valid mind and so if you can sit on it, it's not a hallucination.

Malcolm wrote:
How is a valid mind established as valid? Does the object make it valid?

M

Tsongkhapafan said:
The definition of valid cognizer is a cognizer that is non-deceptive with respect to its engaged object. Conventionally, if the mind is valid the object that it perceives is also valid and exists, and mind and object are mutually dependent.

Malcolm wrote:
If you assert, as you are, that a valid cognizer depends on a valid object, and that a valid object depends on a valid cognition, the consequence of this is two fold: a valid object will always be valid, irregardless of whether it is cognized or not, because it determines whether or not the cognition that perceives it is valid or not. A valid cognizer will always be valid irrespective of whether it's object is delusive or nondelusive because its validity is what makes the object valid.

For example, in a dream, appearances seem valid. We react to them as if they are valid. We only determine dream appearances to be invalid when we wake. How is waking consciousness actually different than a dream consciousnesses? Unlike a dream, we have no outside reference to judge its validity. However, our waking consciousness is merely a dream as well, and when compared with the consciousness of a Buddha, is found to be wholly invalid.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2016 at 8:59 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Queequeg said:

Somethin is happening here. What it is aint exactly clear.

Malcolm wrote:

On the contrary, it is very clear. This is all 1) a backlash of European colonialism 2) failed US foreign policy 3) Failed European domestic policies.

Queequeg said:

The point is, something serious is happening, some really deluded people are running around doing some horrible things, and we need to stop it before they do something really big and set certain reactions in motion that would make things even worse. I do not trust my fellow Americans to take another major attack on the chin without overreacting irrationally.

Malcolm wrote:

We should consider 500,000 children dead from the Iraq embargo, etc. We should consider the on million Iraqis who died in the second Gulf war. We should consider the millions of Iraqis and Iranians who died in a proxy war against Iran Iraq fought for the US. Compared to the losses of Muslims in the Middle East, our losses amount to nothing.

Queequeg said:

Like dealing with deluded beings, often there is nothing to do but try to restrain them and hope they come to their senses.

Malcolm wrote:

We should start by restraining the neoconservative voices in our own government who are addicted to a continually and demonstrably disastrous program of regime change, Honduras being but the latest example.

Queequeg said:

There is a pathology getting passed around like the clap in the Muslim community, and until they deal with it, we can't do much besides defend ourselves.

Malcolm wrote:

This is an excessively parochial view. It merely looks at symptoms, rather than causes. As any physician will tell you, you cannot treat a diseases merely through addressing its symptoms.

Queequeg said:

I am not convinced that they're committed to rooting this pathology out.

Malcolm wrote:
Blame the victim?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, March 25th, 2016 at 8:42 AM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:
Then it's not a wrong awareness but a conventional truth.

Malcolm wrote:
And thus you have admitted there is no difference between conventional truth and delusion, and that the entire edifice of your philosophy is built on a house of cards.

Tsongkhapafan said:
You're talking nonsense Malcolm. Of course there is a difference between a conventional truth and a delusion. A conventional truth is an object of a valid mind and exists and functions, a hallucination cannot; you can't actually sit on a hallucination of a chair because it's not an object of a valid mind and so if you can sit on it, it's not a hallucination.

Malcolm wrote:
How is a valid mind established as valid? Does the object make it valid?

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, March 25th, 2016 at 4:50 AM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:
Then it's not a wrong awareness but a conventional truth.

Malcolm wrote:
And thus you have admitted there is no difference between conventional truth and delusion, and that the entire edifice of your philosophy is built on a house of cards.

Lukeinaz said:
That's a bit much...

Malcolm wrote:

Show the flaw in the reasoning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2016 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

Thus it is the object of a valid mind whereas a chair that is hallucinated cannot perform the function of chair and is a wrong awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

It can if you hallucinate that you are sitting in it.

Tsongkhapa said:

Then it's not a wrong awareness but a conventional truth.

Malcolm wrote:

And thus you have admitted there is no difference between conventional truth and delusion, and that the entire edifice of your philosophy is built on a house of cards.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2016 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But it is not our politics, it is European politics, and has everything to do with the fact that the French and the Belgians initially did not mind here is an international war raging

Queequeg said:

No, there really isn't. Terror is not war.

and if we don't take precautions, people within our borders get killed,

Far more people are killed in the US by right wing terrorists every year than by terrorists who are nominally "muslim."

and that, notwithstanding all the hypocrisy involved in turning a blind eye to the violence beyond our borders and being a major player in the violence, is not good for the situation... Exhibit A: 9-11, we all see how a major attack in NYC got Americans gassed up and pissed, irrationally leading to a war across the whole middle east.

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, an attack, warnings of which our incompetent president ignored.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2016 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

Saoshun said:

Thögal, indeed all of Dzogchen teaching, is not about yogic technique — it is a systematic approach to liberation based on a comprehensive understanding of the Dzogchen account of how one's consciousness effortlessly trapped itself and how it may effortlessly frees itself from the very same trap.

That's it! And this moment conversation should stop and to start cultivation because this explanation is crystal clear.

Malcolm can you relate about support (or supplemental) practice to dzogchen like yantra yoga? Because we have the view or theory and so to speak practice.

I mean I would like to know connection between those two especially dzogchen and yantra yoga.

Malcolm wrote:

Because our mind is stirred by wind, it seeks outside its own state, because it seeks outside its own state, it reifies the five elements; because it reifies the five elements, it takes on bodies. Therefore, to control the mind, control the wind, to control the wind, control the body.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 25th, 2016 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

Thus it is the object of a valid mind whereas a chair that is hallucinated cannot perform the function of chair and is a wrong awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

It can if you hallucinate that you are sitting in it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2016 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

fckw said:

I'm not sure I agree that Dzogchen is not (also) about yogic techniques.

Malcolm wrote:

If you (generally) don't understand the basic theory underlying these things, how they

are essentially just a method of reversing dependent origination, you will just continue in samsaric obsessions.

In other words, without understanding the theory, these things you mention are useless and don't lead anywhere.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2016 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:
running-away.png

Queequeg said:

Actually, many of the actual actors are migrants and the children of earlier migrants, but let's not let facts complicate our politics.

If only this problem were as simple as the reactionary right and reactionary left make it out to be.

Malcolm wrote:

But it is not our politics, it is European politics, and has everything to do with the fact that the French and the Belgians initially did not mind Muslims traveling to Syria to take down Assad.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2016 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

Mere chairs that arise due to causes and conditions and cannot be found upon investigation do exist....

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahahaha, you do realize there is an inherent contradiction in your statement.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2016 at 9:14 PM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

fckw said:

But beyond that the two systems indeed look very similar to me in terms of philosophical approaches. Practice might be different though - or maybe not even. I was surprised to read somewhere in this forum the claim that the Vijnana Bhairava (with which I'm not familiar) apparently contains references to practices similar to Tögel. Of course we can always claim that a certain practice is "not exactly" the same as another one, but such an argument is really futile. Just look at the enormous amount of various tantric texts in Vajrayana, where each and every text says something slightly different than the other one.

Malcolm wrote:

Thögal, indeed all of Dzogchen teaching, is not about yogic technique — it is a systematic approach to liberation based on a comprehensive understanding of the Dzogchen account of how one's consciousness effortlessly trapped itself and how it may effortlessly frees itself from the very same trap.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2016 at 9:08 PM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The basis of the universe in Trika is Shiva, who really exists, and so everything which comes from Shiva really exists. This point is made very clear by Lakshmanjoo in his critique of Advaita Vedanta.

fckw said:

Can you please point me to a resource, where Lakshmanjoo makes this critique? I'd be interested to read this up.

Malcolm wrote:

The third area of difference between Kashmir Śaivism and Vedānta concerns the essence, the substance, the basis of this universe. Vedānta holds that this universe is untrue, unreal. It does not really exist. It is only a creation of illusion (māyā). Concerning this point, Kashmir Śaivism argues that if Lord Śiva is real, then how could an unreal substance come out from something that is real? If Lord Śiva is real, then His creation is also real. Why should it be said that Lord Śiva is real and His creation is an illusion (māyā)? Kashmir Śaivism explains that the existence of this universe is just as real as the existence of Lord Śiva. As such, it is real, pure, and solid. This is nothing about it at all which is unreal."

-- pg. 104, Kashmir Shaivism, The Secret Supreme; 1st Books, 2000.

In Dzogchen it is held that the appearance of the universe is caused by the imputing ignorance which is a result of the neutral awareness at the time the basis arises from the basis not recognizing its own appearances as being its own state. Needless, to say,

that mind is also empty, and lacks any nature or inherent existence. That mind is also individual, which accounts for why Samantabhadra woke up at the time the basis arose from the basis, and sentient beings did not.

In short, the foundation of Dzogchen teachings is the Buddha's teaching of the five elements, five aggregates, emptiness, dependent origination, etc.; while the foundation of Kashmir Shaivism is Samkhya, with an added eleven principles on top of Samkhya's original 25, in addition to asserting there is only one universal puruṣa, Śiva, as opposed to Samkhya's assertion that there are infinite individual puruṣas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2016 at 8:23 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

DGA said:

getting more specific, here are the parallels (which are not identities--he is not saying they are the same, but somehow similar) Reynolds claims

Here there are some philosophical parallels with Dzogchen. Although the Tibetan term *rtsal*, "energy, potency, potentiality", is never glossed as *Shakti* in the Dzogchen texts, the conceptions embodied in these two terms are quite similar. The Dzogchen term *rig-pa'i rtsal*, "the potency or energy of awareness", could almost be translated as *Vidyashakti*, which is a technical term found in the Shaiva and Shakta systems. It refers to the energy inherent within the primordial non-dual Awareness which gives rise to the diversity of manifestations. Also, the term for "manifestation" or "appearance" (*snang-ba*, *abhasa*), is found in a similar context in both systems.

Malcolm has dismissed the idea of a "primordial non-dual Awareness which gives rise to the diversity of manifestation."

OK, but what about the parallel of *rig-pa'i rtsal* and *Vidyashakti*?

Malcolm wrote:

What about *prajñā* in Hinduism and *prajñā* in Buddhism. Are they saying the same thing? Do they have the same meaning? What exactly is "*vidyāshakti*"?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2016 at 7:56 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

Vasana said:

"The nonduality of masculine and feminine completely permeates all beings"

Malcolm wrote:

This translation is incorrect. It is from this passage:

Samantabhadri is the unrestricted vast sphere.
Vast Samantabhadra is displayed to all.
Samantabhadra father and mother have a non-dual single form.
The state of Samantabhadri endowed with the meaning of realization
arises as every diversity since her unchanging bhaga is vast.
The whole universe is included in her bhaga.
The bhaga of the mother is the field of great emptiness.
The non-dual form of the father and mother totally pervade migrating beings.

Vasana said:
Thanks for your translation Malcolm.

Are Samantabhadra and Samantabhadri ever referred to in connection with the 3
principal channels and subtle-body in the same way that Shiva/Shakti are?

Malcolm wrote:
No, it is a different principle altogether.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2016 at 7:55 AM
Title: Re: Non Duality, its Function and Practice.
Content:
DGA said:
Dancer and dance are nondual.

Malcolm wrote:
You don't have to dance, as Nāgārjuna might put, "...apart from someone who has
danced or has not danced, there is no present dancing."

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2016 at 1:29 AM
Title: Re: Non Duality, its Function and Practice.
Content:
jundo cohen said:
Perhaps there is a tendency around Dharma Wheei for people from other fine Traditions
to rush into the Zen section and tell us what we should respond, and to answer
questions asked from a Zen view? The opposite direction seems frowned upon?

Malcolm wrote:
No, there is a tendency for people to ignore sections altogether and just answer
whatever topic they see first. It has nothing to do with Zen.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2016 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Because I provided the Sanskrit to prove it.

Herbie said:

Being a Svatantrika at best you feel as if proving something.

Malcolm wrote:

Umm, not, I am not a svatantra proponent.

If I had a thesis, I would be at fault.

As I alone have no thesis, I alone am without fault.

-- Vigrahavyavartani.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2016 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not my interpretation. If you look at the Sanskrit you will see that this is so.

Herbie said:

That shows exactly that it is your interpretation. How could you otherwise argue in English language about something written in Sanskrit?

Malcolm wrote:

Because I provided the Sanskrit to prove it. You seem to be making the irrational argument that you cannot translate texts or thoughts.

Worse, you are not actually arguing Tsongkhapa's point of view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2016 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Mala's

Content:

Terma said:

Where do you buy yours from? I am in Canada so I would prefer a reliable company with reasonable shipping fees.

I would like a decent quality mala, as I know I can buy them in various shops near by me.

I know certain kinds of mala's should be used for certain practices and not for other practices.

Any suggestions from past experience?

Malcolm wrote:

The universal all around mālā which may be used for all practices is the bodhiseed mala. This a fine mālā. It is not too expensive.

http://www.garudashop.com/Polished_Nepalese_Bodhiseed_Mala_9_to_9_5_mm_p/mala003575.htm

Terma said:

Thanks, Malcolm.

I would like one with dividers for recitation purposes.

Are coral mala's recommended?

Malcolm wrote:

You can add dividers. Coral malas for power, mainly. But given how they are made, and the depletion of the world's coral stocks, etc. I would not buy one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 24th, 2016 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Mala's

Content:

Terma said:

Where do you buy yours from? I am in Canada so I would prefer a reliable company with reasonable shipping fees.

I would like a decent quality mala, as I know I can buy them in various shops near by me.

I know certain kinds of mala's should be used for certain practices and not for other practices.

Any suggestions from past experience?

Malcolm wrote:

The universal all around mālā which may be used for all practices is the bodhiseed mala. This a fine mālā. It is not too expensive.

http://www.garudashop.com/Polished_Nepalese_Bodhiseed_Mala_9_to_9_5_mm_p/mala003575.htm

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 10:53 PM

Title: Re: Non Duality, its Function and Practice.

Content:

jundo cohen said:

...yet not asking the question leaves one speechless.

Malcolm wrote:

This is usually better.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 9:43 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgārjuna defines dependent or extrinsic existence (parabhāva) as a species of inherent existence (svabhāva).

Herbie said:

This is your interpretation.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not my interpretation. If you look at the Sanskrit you will see that this is so.
svabhāvaḥ parabhāvasya parabhāvo hi kathyate||3||

svabhāvaparabhāvābhyāmṛte bhāvaḥ kutaḥ punaḥ|

svabhāve parabhāve vā sati bhāvo hi sidhyati||4||

bhāvasya cedaprasiddhirabhāvo naiva sidhyati|

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 8:57 PM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no universal basis in Dzogchen. The view of Dzogchen is emptiness.

fckw said:

Reading this again, maybe what you mean is that in Shaktism the "universal basis" you mention is seen as a substantial essence, whereas in Dzogchen what is termed Kun Zhi is without substantiality, i.e. it is empty?

Malcolm wrote:

The basis of the universe in Trika is Shiva, who really exists, and so everything which comes from Shiva really exists. This point is made very clear by Lakshmanijoo in his

critique of Advaita Vedanta.

When I say there is no universal basis, I mean that there is no basis taught in Dzogchen which is ontologically real, singular, and overarching. The basis [gzhi, sthana] is one's own unfabricated mind which is originally pure, i.e., empty. The all-basis (kun gzhi, ālaya) in Dzogchen refers to the aspect of mind which gathers traces.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 8:52 PM

Title: Re: Lung disorder

Content:

Miroku said:

That's why I'd like to ask if anyone of you had any experience with developing lung disorder and how did you treat it? Also what would you recommend to prevent lung from happening? What kind of behaviour in daily life can cause it? And in general I'd like to ask you to share some of your info and experience concerning this topic.

Malcolm wrote:

You follow vatta reducing diet and behavior.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 8:48 PM

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.

Malcolm wrote:

Virgo is coming from a tradition where before one can even really begin to say one is practicing the main point, first one has to distinguish the mind (sems, citta) from pristine consciousness (ye shes, jñāna). One must also learn the distinction between ignorance (ma rig pa, avidyā) and knowledge (rig pa, vidyā, usually mistranslated as "awareness" by translators of Tibetan texts.)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Herbie said:

This is exactly what dependent existence is because everything that is imputedly existent is dependently existent, i.e. dependent on imputation.

Malcolm wrote:

Herbie, there are four terms at work here: svabhāva, parabhāva, bhāva and abhāva.

Nāgārjuna defines dependent or extrinsic existence (parabhāva) as a species of inherent existence (svabhāva).

As I pointed out to you already, bhāva (existence) is included in svabhāva.

Nāgārjuna is saying that if you cannot prove or establish svabhāva, you cannot prove bhāva. If you cannot prove bhāva, you also cannot show abhāva, i.e., nonexistence, since abhāva is always the nonexistence of something that once existed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

Vasana said:

"The nonduality of masculine and feminine completely permeates all beings"

Malcolm wrote:

This translation is incorrect. It is from this passage:

Samantabhadri is the unrestricted vast sphere.

Vast Samantabhadra is displayed to all.

Samantabhadra father and mother have a non-dual single form.

The state of Samantabhadri endowed with the meaning of realization arises as every diversity since her unchanging bhaga is vast.

The whole universe is included in her bhaga.

The bhaga of the mother is the field of great emptiness.

The non-dual form of the father and mother totally pervade migrating beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: View in Dzogchen and Shaktism

Content:

fckw said:

According to The Golden Letters, there are significant similarities between the Dzogchen and Shaktism view.

The view associated with Kashmiri Shaivism and with Shaktism is known as Shaktivada,

wherein Maya, or the world illusion, in all its diversity, is granted a certain ontological status. This diversity is an illusion in the sense that it lacks any inherent or independent reality, but it does possess a kind of relative reality in that it represents the energy, or shakti, of Chit, or primordial awareness (chitshakti). Maya is thus not just a mistake in perception, mistaking the rope for a snake; it is not something merely passive but something active and dynamic, a creative energy, or Mayashakti, which brings diversity into manifestation. Here there are some philosophical parallels with Dzogchen. Although the Tibetan term rtsal, “energy, potency, potentiality”, is never glossed as Shakti in the Dzogchen texts, the conceptions embodied in these two terms are quite similar. The Dzogchen term rig-pa'i rtsal, “the potency or energy of awareness”, could almost be translated as Vidyashakti, which is a technical term found in the Shaiva and Shakta systems. It refers to the energy inherent within the primordial non-dual Awareness which gives rise to the diversity of manifestations. Also, the term for “manifestation” or “appearance” (snang-ba, abhasa), is found in a similar context in both systems.

(John Myrdhin Reynolds, source:

<http://www.kamakotimandali.com/blog/index.php?p=1272&more=1&c=1&tb=1&pb=1>)

Could anyone more knowledgeable go a little bit into the similarities and differences between the two philosophical views?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no universal basis in Dzogchen. The view of Dzogchen is emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 3:31 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Have any of your living Teachers given away intentionally something as precious as their eyes to a beggar woman? If not, why not?

Malcolm wrote:

They gave me the Dharma, what eye is more precious than that?

jundo cohen said:

Tell that to the beggar woman!

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you know, the beggar women did not appreciate it, and she ate Aryadeva's eye, rather than putting it in her head. In case the meaning is not clear, just because you give someone eyes, it does not mean that they will use them to see. Likewise, trotting out your "profound" point of view can be like casting pearls before swine, or like the embarrassing moment when someone shows you their tattoo of the Dalai Lama that covers half of their back.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Have any of your living Teachers given away intentionally something as precious as their eyes to a beggar woman? If not, why not?

Malcolm wrote:

They gave me the Dharma, what eye is more precious than that? But to answer your question more directly, in fact my deceased teacher, Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, regularly put his life at risk by ministering to poor people in Assam, to the point where he contracted TB of the bone. He also spent many years wandering from Tibet to India and Bhutan as a homeless yogi living under trees and begging for food, many years prior to the Chinese invasion in '59 before settling in Assam in the mid 60's.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: Bodhisattvabhumi (Tsadra) Hardcover – March 8, 2016 by Asanga (Author), Artemus B. Engle (Translator)

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It's quite good. I have a copy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: Cannibalism in Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

sha za is a translation of piśaci. "Rakṣasas", sriṇ po, clearly refer to memories of Indian encounters with head hunters which inhabited the islands surrounding India from New Guinea and Borneo all the way to Madagascar, and who used to dominate Śri Lanka. In fact, the language of Borneo head hunters is related to only one other language in the world, the language of Madagascar.

Sherab Dorje said:

Seems you have forgotten the VERY Indian head hunters: the Naga of Northern India and Burma.

Malcolm wrote:

I have not forgotten them, they are the ones referred to as piśacis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

jundo cohen said:

It negates completely (or, better said, one finds nothing in need of correction or repair from the start, all an Affirmation). To allow the sentient beings to realize so is to "save sentient beings" (who, by the way, are not truly "sentient beings in need of saving" from the start). As Buddha, no healing required. There is here no hunger, no poverty, no war ... never was or has been or will be.

Malcolm wrote:

When you have the capacity to give away your wife and children (with their consent of course) to be the slaves of a brahmin, or your eyes to a beggar woman, then I will believe you have the understanding your words profess, and not until then.

These kinds of words are very easy to say. Just watch:

Since in me there is no birth nor death,
the qualities of cessation are totally perfect.
Since in me there is no inside nor outside,
the qualities of clarity are totally perfect.
Since in me there is no emptiness or things,
the qualities of appearances are totally perfect.
Since in me there is no object of perception,
perceptible objects are totally perfect.
Since in me there is no body or mind,
self-apparent qualities are totally perfect.
Since in me there is no self and other,
the five qualities of vidyā are totally perfect.
Since in me there is no creative cause,
total concentration is totally perfect.
Since in me there is no place to go,
the self-apparent domain is totally perfect.
Since in me there are no directions or sides,
secret vidyā is totally perfect.
Since in me appearances do not cease,
the three qualities of the ultimate dhātu are totally perfect.
Since in me there is no one and two,
the qualities of the bindu are totally perfect.
Since in me there is no darkness or light,
the qualities of direct perception are totally perfect.
Since in me there are neither self nor concepts,
the qualities of emptiness are totally perfect.
Since in me the two stains do not exist,
the five qualities of clarity are totally perfect.

Since in me the five kāyas appear of themselves,
the ultimate nature of the buddhafiels is totally perfect.
Since in me there is no emanating and gathering,
the meaning of syllables are totally perfect.
But do you believe I am a realized person based on some words I translated from an old Tibetan book? No you don't, nor should you. Likewise, your capacity to rattle off elementary PP sūtra stuff does not impress.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Cannibalism in Buddhism

Content:

fckw said:

In certain Tibetan texts, the rakshasas are claimed to be cannibal demons. But, quite obviously, they don't follow any Buddhist ethics.

dzoki said:

I think the whole thing with the cannibal rakshasas etc. is a wrong translation. Cannibal is a human eating humans. Rakshasa not being human cannot be a cannibal. Same way as one would not call a tiger hunting humans a cannibal.

Tibetan texts often use expression sha za = meat eating/meat eater which some people then translate as cannibal, but this is not implied in Tibetan.

Malcolm wrote:

sha za is a translation of piśāci. "Rakṣasas", srin po, clearly refer to memories of Indian encounters with head hunters which inhabited the islands surrounding India from New Guinea and Borneo all the way to Madagascar, and who used to dominate Śrī Lanka. In fact, the language of Borneo head hunters is related to only one other language in the world, the language of Madagascar.

The Ramayāna and the Nyingma accounts of the Taming of Rudra epics can be seen as mythological retellings of the conquest of Śrī Lanka by Indians in the first millenia BCE.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

conebeckham said:

When we use the word "existence," we are talking about ontology--this is not the realm of "any person's" perception of phenomenon, but is the realm of mental constructs regarding ontology. No such constructs can be admitted, in Madhyamaka. This is why we take issue with claiming any sort of "mode of existence" on the level of convention.

Yet phenomena appear. No one denies this.

Malcolm wrote:

The Gelugpas invented a "Prasanga" that is really just crypto svatantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgārjuna himself makes it very plain that by "existence," he means "inherent existence," by asking the question:

Where will there be an existent not included
in inherent existence or dependent existence?

Herbie said:

All are included in dependent, i.e. imputed existence.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not here what dependent existence is.

Anyway, if existence and inherent existence are both merely imputations, you have established there is no reason to negate one and affirm the other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: New Guru Rinpoche art by Alex Grey

Content:

Ayu said:

I was assuming it, because once I asked an artist, who has painted many big pictures of dieties already, if it is appropriate to paint also the respective root-syllables at the certain spot. Her answer was, no, she didn't think it was appropriate. You don't see any dieties with syllables in old pictures.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure you do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Cannibalism in Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

These kinds of meats were dragged to the charnel ground in ancient India.

Queequeg said:

We have an example of a teaching for particular circumstances not carrying the same meaning outside of that context without having to include footnotes.

No point to that comment. Just an observation.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 23rd, 2016 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But in actual fact, the sensory experience of buddhas is not confined to their six sense gates in the way ours are.

Astus said:

And this is where the interpretation and view of the teachings come in. For Chan the mind is buddha and there is no other buddha to be found.

Malcolm wrote:

It is the same in Tibetan Buddhism. Mind operate through sense organs. When a mind is limited by karma and afflictions, a mind is limited in terms of what sense organs it operates through, and how.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2016 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Alcohol

Content:

dharmagoat said:

I understand that the precepts point to the fact that mindfulness is challenging enough when sober, and that consuming any amount of alcohol will deaden our faculties to some degree. This, of course, is especially important for monks and other full-time practitioners.

Malcolm wrote:

If you can't integrate it, avoid it. That applies to everything we consume with all five senses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2016 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:
dharmagoat said:
How real do they need to be?

They are real enough to act on them.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, and that underlies the question Virgo is asking. To what extent does ultimate truth negate the need to act on behalf of suffering sentient beings. The answer, it does not negate this need at all.

DGA said:
In my opinion, many contemporary Zen teachers know this very well, as evidenced in their emphasis on "engaged" practice.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, I agree. Many contemporary Zen teachers do know this, as well as Theravadins. Frankly, it is Tibetan Buddhists who are rather deeply behind the curve on this point.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2016 at 10:31 PM
Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow
Content:

Virgo said:
Let me guess, sentient beings have never been ignorant? In a conventional sense there is no birth in samsara? Suffering is not real, slavery is not real, abuses are not real, people are not real, harming others is not real?

dharmagoat said:
How real do they need to be?

They are real enough to act on them.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, and that underlies the question Virgo is asking. To what extent does ultimate truth negate the need to act on behalf of suffering sentient beings. The answer, it does not negate this need at all.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2016 at 10:28 PM
Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow
Content:

Malcolm wrote:

They are "supernatural" compared to your abilities and mine, which is actually the point.

Astus said:

What I meant is that such abilities are not about magic powers (or synesthesia), but that categories of experiences are the works of conceptual discrimination, and concepts are interrelated and interpenetrate each other.

Malcolm wrote:

But in actual fact, the sensory experience of buddhas is not confined to their six sense gates in the way ours are. This is a fact of our karmic rebirth, and nothing more. This is why buddhas, highly realized people, do not have the same cognitive limitations that you and I do (such as only being able to see with our eyes, or hear with our ears) — they have overcome the karmic limitations of their embodiment as human beings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2016 at 9:54 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Astus said:

You might consider those abilities of the Buddha as supernatural abilities, but in Chan that is not so.

Malcolm wrote:

They are "supernatural" compared to your abilities and mine, which is actually the point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2016 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: Chan, Mahamudra, and Tibet

Content:

crazy-man said:

There's a Chinese manuscript from Dunhuang (Pelliot chinois 4646) that tells another debate story...

Malcolm wrote:

Since this is direct quote from SVS's website, it really out to be in quote brackets...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2016 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: New Guru Rinpoche art by Alex Grey

Content:

Ayu said:

Maybe this mistake was made intentionally? Such syllables are restricted and not

supposed to be shared to the public, I assume.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is artistic license, it was nothing to do with being secret. There is nothing secret about མཛུགས་སྒྲིག་.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2016 at 4:43 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Herbie said:

What the hell do we have to do with people in India?

Be serious and honest. you irrationalists are the ones who are arguening with others using Nagarjuna's irrational tetralemma as argument. Nobody ever who argued with others using Nagarjunians tetralemma has ever made the point that his tetralemma has not to be taken as one unit of argument. Irrational people take the tetralemma as such, they take it as a one logical unit of argumentation. And Tsongkhapa has shown already hundreds of years ago that that is irrational bullshit. And even more than thouand years before Tsongkhapa it was Aristoteles who showed what a rational tetralemma has to be like.

Malcolm wrote:

You just seem to fail to understand that in the four fold negation of existence, each term had a specific target in mind, in the context of ancient Indian polemics [eternalists, nihilists, jains, and sophists of various types respectively]. If you want to understand Nāgārjuna, you have to understand that.

Nāgārjuna himself makes it very plain that by "existence," he means "inherent existence," by asking the question:

Where will there be an existent not included
in inherent existence or dependent existence?

If inherent existence and dependent existence exist,
existents will be established.

If an existent is not established
a non-existent will not established.

Tsongkhapa's whole philosophy turns on this point.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2016 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

Suppose that you refute the tetralemma without affixing any such qualifications [comm:

like essentially, inherently, intrinsically]:

you refute the position that things exist and you refute the position that things do not exist; you then say "It is not the case that they both exist and do not exist". If you now continue with the refutation saying "It is also not the case that they are neither existent nor nonexistent", then you explicitly contradict your own position. If you then stubbornly insist, "Even so, there is no fallacy", then the debate is over because we do not debate with the obstinate.

Malcolm wrote:

Tsongkhapa is refuting a position no one takes.

Let me spell it out for you again. Nāgārjuna makes the contention that existence is actually a subset of inherent existence, when it is analyzed [not before]. When existence [inherent existence] is negated, the nonexistence of that existence is negated as well [since there is nothing present to be negated]. The third term, "existent and nonexistent" is refuted because there are some who claim that in the process of arising, a given thing can be asserted to both exist and not exist at the same time. The fourth term, neither existent nor non-existent, was refuted to refute sophists.

Since Tsongkhapa never had to deal with Jains, etc, he in effect never really saw the point of the third term, and assumed they were unnecessary double negatives. But in India, there were people who asserted both the third term and the fourth term, so it was necessary to reject all four extremes in turn.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2016 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: What's lineage, what is it for, & how does it work?

Content:

DGA said:

Those threads are comparatively tame to what we experienced with Lepine on the now-defunct e-sangha discussion board,

Malcolm wrote:

He was the one of the folks around whom the issue of ordination and who was a monk originally came up, in addition to that dude in LA, "tendai," now defunct it seems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2016 at 2:09 AM

Title: Re: Cannibalism in Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, let's define cannibalism. And yes, these things are actually supposed to be secret. However, they are mentioned as meats that no one wants, to overcome one's

attachment to food.

Queequeg said:

I did not realize they are secret - I got the text from Amazon so I figured... (this issue might fit in with a recent discussion in the Nichiren forum about the possibility of ordering Buddhist funeral services through the retailer).

Should I request my post be deleted?

Cow, dog, horse are definitely consumed in non-negligible amounts - I've had two of those three, and can't say I wouldn't try the third, and certainly can't say the thought of a medium grilled strip steak is going to inspire aversion in me. Handling meat does make me feel ill at ease, and I sometimes contemplate the horror behind the succulent bites of steak... I think of going veg, but almost always manana.

Malcolm wrote:

These kinds of meats were dragged to the charnel ground in ancient India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2016 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Herbie said:

Everybody experiences the psycho-mental phenomenon corresponding to the philosophical object "inherent existence" when perceiving common objects but nobody knows about it being that which is superimposed on these objects and which these objects are empty of. Even those studying Prasangika do not know unless they have identified it at least indirectly in their awarenesses.

Malcolm wrote:

I refer you to the quote above.

Herbie said:

"Since the object of negation does not in fact exist, it cannot actually be ascertained, because ascertainment implies a valid mind realizing an object that exists.

Well yes, but what does "does not in fact exist" mean from the speakers perspective?

And what does "cannot actually be ascertained" mean from the speakers perspective?

And what does "valid mind" mean from the speaker perspective?

So obviously he introduces "actual existence" (existing in fact) in addition to "ultimate existence" and "dependent or imputed existence". That is a novelty!

Malcolm wrote:

I know it is incredibly inconvenient for you that a ranking Gelug scholar disputes your ideas, but there it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2016 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No one experiences inherent existence, even conventionally.

Herbie said:

Everybody experiences the psycho-mental phenomenon corresponding to the philosophical object "inherent existence" when perceiving common objects but nobody knows about it being that which is superimposed on these objects and which these objects are empty of. Even those studying Prasangika do not know unless they have identified it at least indirectly in their awarenesses.

Malcolm wrote:

I refer you to the quote above.

Herbie said:

"Since the object of negation does not in fact exist, it cannot actually be ascertained, because ascertainment implies a valid mind realizing an object that exists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2016 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Astus said:

What "ordinary fellow" signifies is that the six senses function as before, the difference is in whether there is attachment.

Malcolm wrote:

But do they actually? A buddha can taste with his sight, smell with his fingers and hear with his tongue, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2016 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: Cannibalism in Buddhism

Content:

Queequeg said:

"For substances of enjoyment, in outer tantras one enjoys three white or pure substances - milk, butter and curd - and three sweet substances - molasses, honey, and sugar. In inner tantras one enjoys five meats - the flesh of man, cow, dog, horse, and elephant - and five nectars - excrement, semen, brain, blood (seminal fluid of female),

and urine."

-The Practice of Dzogchen: Lonchempa Rabjam's Writings on the Great Perfection

I don't think I'm revealing anything particularly secret. The statements are out there, so, let's address them.

Is the suggestion of cannibalism literal or what?

I'm guessing, "or what".

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, let's define cannibalism. And yes, these things are actually supposed to be secret. However, they are mentioned as meats that no one wants, to overcome one's attachment to food.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 22nd, 2016 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: Gory comentarial literature

Content:

Queequeg said:

If you want these sorts of stories, read the Jatakas - and not the collections edited for young audiences. Those tend to be just variations on Aesop's fables.

Malcolm wrote:

Other way around, demonstrably so,

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 11:46 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Revise to "...when the Indian Mahāyāna view of the bodhisattva path is used, there is no basis for Zen's and Tiantai's teachings of enlightenment in one life," then we can agree.

Astus said:

I'm OK with that, if we modify it to "Late-Indian Mahayana", or something to a similar extent. After all, Chinese Buddhism has Indian origins as well, but then it's developed on a separate path, and that's why even Xuanzang's teachings have not been as widely accepted as Fazang's.

Malcolm wrote:

We have no evidence, apart from perhaps Bodhidharma, of any kind of sudden awakening school in India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 11:29 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Astus said:

Naturally, when the Tibetan view of the bodhisattva path is used, there is no basis for Zen's and Tiantai's teachings of enlightenment in one life.

Malcolm wrote:

Revise to "...when the Indian Mahāyāna view of the bodhisattva path is used, there is no basis for Zen's and Tiantai's teachings of enlightenment in one life," then we can agree. The conflict in Tibet was never between Tibetans and Chinese, it was between Indians and Chinese. This is why many early Tibetans, such as Nubchen, and later Longchenpa, etc., sided with the Chinese with respect to the outcome of the Samye debate.

DGA said:

is this another way of saying that TienTai and Ch'an may have more in common with, say, Dzogchen (viz. Lonchenpa) than Indian Mahayana, to your mind?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, absolutely. Chan is based on definitive Mahāyāna sūtras, unlike the graded path approach of Kamalashila. Indians were just as selective about their reading of Mahāyāna as any other movement. In other words, there were winning and losing trends of Mahāyāna in India itself. Indian Buddhism over all went for gradualism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Astus said:

Naturally, when the Tibetan view of the bodhisattva path is used, there is no basis for Zen's and Tiantai's teachings of enlightenment in one life.

Malcolm wrote:

Revise to "...when the Indian Mahāyāna view of the bodhisattva path is used, there is no basis for Zen's and Tiantai's teachings of enlightenment in one life," then we can agree. The conflict in Tibet was never between Tibetans and Chinese, it was between Indians and Chinese. This is why many early Tibetans, such as Nubchen, and later Longchenpa, etc., sided with the Chinese with respect to the outcome of the Samye debate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Your descriptions sound very similar to the Vedantic notion of brahman. You don't merge with brahman, you always were brahman, but you just did not recognize it.

jundo cohen said:

The light of Enlightenment is still shining in as and through the parsing of terms and spinning of mental wheels, but one must look through all the churning thoughts of categories and distinctions. Easier to see when the mind mazes are dropped.

Malcolm wrote:

You, Jundo, in particular keep using the term "Enlightenment" and "Buddha" as if it were some state that exists as the basis for everything and everyone.

Is this really how you see things? I mean if so, that is nice, but I have a hard time distinguishing this from Hinduism.

jundo cohen said:

We are always Enlightened and ever (without beginning or end) Buddha. Always have been, always will, for all time without measure of time, for you me and everyone.

However, we are not Enlightened, and remain separate from Buddha until we realize so.

Once we realize so, we see that we were always Enlightened and always are precisely Buddha and there was nothing in need of realizing from the get go. Until we realize so, there is need to so realize.

Buddha is not a fellow or godhead we try to merge with, so I am not sure of the reference to Hinduism. There is no need to merge with what one already is, both a fellow and not a fellow, a thing, all things and no things.

Gassho, J

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 10:27 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

jundo cohen said:

The light of Enlightenment is still shining in as and through the parsing of terms and spinning of mental wheels, but one must look through all the churning thoughts of categories and distinctions. Easier to see when the mind mazes are dropped.

Malcolm wrote:

You, Jundo, in particular keep using the term "Enlightenment" and "Buddha" as if it were some state that exists as the basis for everything and everyone.

Is this really how you see things? I mean if so, that is nice, but I have a hard time distinguishing this from Hinduism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: What's lineage, what is it for, & how does it work?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Where is the salient comment?

DGA said:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=2061>

Hi Malcolm, you might remember someone in Quebec selling magic ninja lessons from the e-sangha days. This fellow:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?t=3949&start=20#p37441>

The thread I linked above was about him. It turns out that he is an associate of our friends at Hongaku Jodo--affiliated with them somehow. Seishin pointed this out here.

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=2061#p14754>

and some of Lepine's webpages are listed on the Hongaku Jodo page.

I was expressing surprise that this comparatively anodyne thread had caught their attention, but previous discussions that were much more critical and were about them specifically had not.

Malcolm wrote:

I meant where in the video.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Bakmoon said:

Malcom's point is basically this: If the object of negation is experienced by individuals, then that would make it conventionally existent, but everyone including Tsongkhapa rejects the idea that intrinsic existence exists conventionally. And if the object of negation is not experienced by individuals, then how on earth can people identify it as per Tsongkhapa's instructions?

Tsongkhapafan said:

Of course the object of negation is experienced by individuals.

Malcolm wrote:

No one experiences inherent existence, even conventionally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Astus said:

Those who practice the Great Vehicle use the method of “transformation (of the mind)” because they understand that amid our afflictions there is our inherent Buddha nature. It is like forging steel from iron. The nature of steel is within the wrought iron. If we throw away the pieces of iron, we will not be able to refine the steel. Similarly, “there is no water besides the waves.” Therefore, in Mahayana, bodhisattvas cultivate the myriad good practices of the six paramitas. By benefiting self and others, they transform afflictions, and return to their pure inherent nature. Just as when we practice charity for a long time, we will naturally diminish greed. By contemplation of compassion, anger will naturally subside. When we are diligent in the cultivation of actions, speech, and mind, we can overcome sloth. When the mind is scattered and confused, we must use samadhi to overcome delusive thoughts. This is known as “transformation.” The last of the six paramitas is “prajna.” Prajna overcomes ignorance. Our mind is filled with ignorance and confusion; it easily forms attachments to the external environment. If we can reflect inward, without falling into dualism, without the concept of subject and object, and attain “triple emptiness,” we will attain prajna paramita. We can then face each encounter with clarity and mindfulness, thereby extinguish all our afflictions.

In the Ultimate Vehicle, we neither transform our afflictions nor extinguish them; our mind is originally pure and lucid. This mind is inherent in everyone; we do not need to seek it externally. This is the Chan School’s principle of “affliction is bodhi; birth and death (samsara) is nirvana.””[i]

(http://ctzen.org/sunnyvale/enUS/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=219&Itemid=59)

Malcolm wrote:

I am pretty certain I don't agree with the characterization of Mahāyāna ārya practice above.

I fail to see a distinction between this so called "great vehicle" and this so called "ultimate vehicle." For example, the Saṃdhinirmocana Sūtra states:

The characteristic of the element of formations and the ultimate is the characteristic of being free from being the same or different; whoever conceives them as being the same or different, they have entered in improper view.

And the Madhyāntavibhāga states:

These two, samsara and nirvana,

arise adventitiously.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 9:23 PM

Title: Re: recommended Dzogchen retreats/courses/teachers

Content:

florin said:

As i said , there are no uk based dzogchen teachers.

But you could do what Malcolm suggested .That would be best.

DGA said:

Is James Low not based in the UK? this link was already offered in this thread...

<http://www.simplybeing.co.uk>

I'm eager to get to Tenerife myself...

Malcolm wrote:

I don't generally recommend teachers with whom I have no personal experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

... The notion that there substantial differences in ultimate truth between the two approaches is a novelty introduced by Tsongkhapa.

Herbie said:

"Novelty" certainly is relative because an interpretation that differs from other interpretations is just another interpretation. I mean Tsongkhapa and other interpreters, they all referred to the same main Madhyamaka sources. The difference of Tsongkhapa's philosophy is that it is completely rational as to use of language in the context of objects of knowledge and that there are no mystical esoteric gaps in his philosophy represented often by the term "ineffable". Because of its linguistic rationality there is no need to seek refuge in esoteric concepts. Objects are objects of knowledge and what is known can be linguistically and consistently expressed. The hallmark of his philosophy is the concept of "inherent existence" which renders the concept of "emptiness" philosophically intelligible because speaking of something as empty one should be able to say what it is empty of without damaging the world of human conventions which includes the conventions of language, the conventions of all sciences, the conventions of all religions and the conventions of all philosophies. In this

sense Tsongkhapa's philosophy as philosophy is a meta-system because it covers all other systems and thus it is also perfectly applicable in a non-religious ("secular") context.

Malcolm wrote:

[The Buddha:]

When all phenomena are done away with,[4]
all means of speaking
are done away with as well.

<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/kn/snp/snp.5.06.than.html>

This is the essential core of Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 9:09 PM

Title: Re: What's lineage, what is it for, & how does it work?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Where is the salient comment?

DGA said:

I was sent a link to this video today. Congratulations, DharmaWheelers: internet celebrities we are.

```
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]
```

For the record, and as I've said elsewhere, I really don't care if anyone wants to start their own school or tradition or lineage or banh mi sandwich cart for that matter. Do whatever you like, and trust that others will do the same--and whatever they like might include asking questions about your sandwiches and their prices on public venues.

Postscript:

forgot to add this to an earlier post. I wonder why it is that this thread on lineage has struck a nerve, but earlier discussions of this school and its offshoots has not.
<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=2061>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

jundo cohen said:

...Sentient beings are not "born in Samsara," they never have been ... they just think they are.

Malcolm wrote:

That is sufficient for being born in samsara.

[Edit]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 6:51 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Question: how is the awakening put forward in Chan different than realization of an Arhat?

Astus said:

See for yourself the differences described:

"Whoever knows that the mind is a fiction and devoid of anything real knows that his own mind neither exists nor doesn't exist. Mortals keep creating the mind, claiming it exists. And Arhats keep negating the mind, claiming it doesn't exist. But bodhisattvas and Buddhas neither create nor negate the mind. This is what's meant by the mind that neither exists nor doesn't exist. The mind that neither exists nor doesn't exist is called the Middle Way."

(Bodhidharma: Wake-up Sermon)

Malcolm wrote:

This is certainly a Mahāyāna doxographical claim. And further, what is the difference then between a bodhisattva and buddha? This distinction is the one that you really fail to tease out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 5:05 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That's it then, just see the nature of the mind and you are omniscient? If this is case, would you then claim that first stage bodhisattvas have not seen the nature of the mind? Because they are certainly not omniscient.

Astus said:

As far as the fully sudden approach goes, only buddhas know it. Consider <http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?p=329214#p329214>, where Huangbo makes it clear what one is enlightened to directly and how it compares to the gradual path.

Also, Dazhu says:

Q: What is Sudden Enlightenment?

A: "Sudden" means instantly stopping false thought. "Enlightenment" means [awareness] that one attains nothing.

and

"Sudden Enlightenment means liberation during this lifetime. Just as a lion-cub, from the moment it is born, is a real lion, likewise anyone who practices the Sudden-Enlightenment method has, from the moment he begins his practice, already entered the Buddha-Stage. Just as the bamboo-shoots growing in springtime are not different from the parent bamboo-shoots, because they are also empty inside, likewise anyone who practices the Sudden-Enlightenment method to rid himself suddenly of false thought abandons, like the Buddhas, the sense of an ego and a personality forever. Being absolutely deep, still and void, he is, then, without an iota of difference, equal to the Buddhas. Thus, in this sense it can be said that the worldly is holy. If one practices the Sudden-Enlightenment method, he can transcend the three realms during this lifetime."

Malcolm wrote:

Astus,

Being free from rebirth in the three realms is arhatship, not buddhahood. Arhats also realize emptiness.

Question: how is the awakening put forward in Chan different than realization of an Arhat?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: recommended Dzogchen retreats/courses/teachers

Content:

Saoshun said:

I actually checked everything and I'm going. Thanks Malcolm. I will just go and see what happens, like buddha. Either I realize or die.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, death is inevitable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: recommended Dzogchen retreats/courses/teachers

Content:

Saoshun said:

That's what I did found but there is dzogchen bon teacher but opinions on him are not really good as lama, his name is Lama Khyimsar Rinpoche or something like that

<http://www.dzogchencommunityuk.org/>

<http://www.simplybeing.co.uk/>

Malcolm wrote:

Go to Tenerife.

Saoshun said:

Norbu welcome openly guys from dharmawheel forums?

Malcolm wrote:

I have sent scores of people to see ChNN from this and other forums. But it is not like you should introduce yourself with "Malcolm told me to come." Just go and receive teachings. That is sufficient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: recommended Dzogchen retreats/courses/teachers

Content:

florin said:

There are no Uk based dzogchen teachers i'm afraid.

Saoshun said:

That's what I did found but there is dzogchen bon teacher but opinions on him are not really good as lama, his name is Lama Khyimsar Rinpoche or something like that

<http://www.dzogchencommunityuk.org/>

<http://www.simplybeing.co.uk/>

Malcolm wrote:

Go to Tenerife.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: New Guru Rinpoche art by Alex Grey

Content:

Vasana said:

It's a shame the མཆོག་ is incorrect, as you pointed out, Malcolm.

On the plus side, i think the new work will spark a wave of curiosity in his fans who aren't familiar with Guru Rinpoche or with this side of Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Painters make mistakes on thangkhas and paintings all the time, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 2:50 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Realizing emptiness is not realizing "dharmakāya." The realization of the dharmakāya is attended by the twin omniscience concerning the nature of what exists and all that exists. Now, if you wish to redefine, or dumb down, dharmakāya to make it seem more attainable, I can't stop you. But it is an error to do so.

Astus said:

No need to dumb down anything. All three knowledges/wisdoms are included in seeing the nature of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

That's it then, just see the nature of the mind and you are omniscient? If this is case, would you then claim that first stage bodhisattvas have not seen the nature of the mind? Because they are certainly not omniscient.

I suspect you are taking a short position on a stock that is going up.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Alcohol

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It balances the humors and is beneficial for all illnesses, in particular, since it removes kapha, wind and combination illnesses, among medicines, it is the supreme medicinal amrita:

the qualities of delicious booze are perfect.

fckw said:

From your experience as a Tibetan doctor, would you say alcohol indeed removes wind-related illnesses?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, 10 year old Tawny Port or a four year old red wine. One glass.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: New Guru Rinpoche art by Alex Grey

Content:

maybay said:

Unusual. I would have made the glow of the letters the same color as the letters. Letters are generally too prominent for my liking.

Malcolm wrote:

Personally, I think it is a pretty ugly painting. He has done much better work in the past.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that unlike poor schmucks like us, Buddha does not take rebirth in samsara [i.e. buddhas do not take afflicted birth]. Somehow, what is lost in this discussion is the existential purpose of the Dharma, ending birth in samsara, and aiding other sentient beings to do the same. Without these two aims, there is no Buddhadharma at all.

Arjan Dirkse said:

I agree, but is that extraordinary? In the end we all have Buddha nature, it might be the most supremely ordinary thing of all.

Malcolm wrote:

While buddhanature is not extraordinary, recognizing it is, and we should not fool ourselves as to how rare it is that it is recognized, let alone realized.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Arjan Dirkse said:

What is ordinary, what is extra-ordinary? In the end they're just subjective categories we make up to create divisions. Everything is just the way it is.

I don't believe Buddha is extraordinary, but I am not sure whether he is ordinary.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that unlike poor schmucks like us, Buddha does not take rebirth in samsara [i.e. buddhas do not take afflicted birth]. Somehow, what is lost in this discussion is the existential purpose of the Dharma, ending birth in samsara, and aiding other sentient beings to do the same. Without these two aims, there is no Buddhadharma at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 21st, 2016 at 12:04 AM

Title: Re: New Guru Rinpoche art by Alex Grey

Content:

Vasana said:

Alex grey posted this yesterday. Had to share!

Malcolm wrote:

The ལྷོ་ལྷོ་ is painted incorrectly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 20th, 2016 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are two so called Prasangika views: the original one introduced to Tibet by Jayananda and his translator, Patsab Nyima Drag in the 12th century, and the later reformulation introduced by Tsongkhapa.

The differences in the view between the original formulators of the distinction, prasanga and svatantra, only referred to how emptiness was to be taught, not in any substantial difference in view of ultimate truth. The notion that there substantial differences in ultimate truth between the two approaches is a novelty introduced by Tsongkhapa.

Herbie said:

Then I have to add another meaning of the expression "inherent existence does not exist conventionally" which follows from the fact that the existence of phenomena/objects depends on imputation by individuals:

There are "common" objects only considering the merely linguistic means of expression in that a community uses the same language. However the formation of concepts is an individual matter because concept is the combination of "word + idea ". So while people of one linguistic community use the same words the ideas associated with these words vary on the level of individuals, inter-individually. And since all objects/phenomena only exist dependent on conceptual imputation there are actually no completely "common" objects because of the inter-individual variations in concept formation.

That is why "inherent existence does not exist conventionally" is often used to differentiate the Prasangika view from Svatantrika view because in Svatantrika philosophy it is assumed that when people use the same linguistical designator (word) the object which appears to all of them individually is identical. But this cannot be the case from a Prasangika perspective because that would presume inherent existence of the object discussed by several individuals, i.e. existence of the object by way of its own objective character independent of each individual's conceptual imputation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 20th, 2016 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Wayfarer said:

So my remark was about the seemingly black-and-white nature of this approach: enlightenment being immediate and complete, with a 'miss being as good as a mile'.

Astus said:

One is either a buddha, completely free from ignorance, or not. I think that's a fairly mainstream position even in the gradual paths. Similarly, if one has attained any level of nobility, there is no way back from that, as it includes permanent eradication of some defilements. Consequently, one has either realised the nature of mind, the dharmakaya, or not. That does not mean one cannot have concepts about the nature of mind, and even correct views.

Malcolm wrote:

And this, Astus, is the crux of the problem. Realizing emptiness is not realizing "dharmakāya." The realization of the dharmakāya is attended by the twin omniscience concerning the nature of what exists and all that exists. Now, if you wish to redefine, or dumb down, dharmakāya to make it seem more attainable, I can't stop you. But it is an error to do so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 20th, 2016 at 10:58 AM

Title: Re: Cannibalism in Buddhism

Content:

Dundee said:

Is cannibalism strictly forbidden in Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 20th, 2016 at 10:57 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Dundee said:

Our problems seem crazy because we lead the world and have world class level leadership struggles.

Malcolm wrote:

We only "lead" the world because we spend the most on guns...in every other respect, we are deficient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 20th, 2016 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

DGA said:

I'd thought that the character translated as Way in that instance (道), which is the same as Tao from Taoism, really does mean path, and is sometimes used to render the term Dharma. I'd thought bodhi was rendered in another way. Perhaps I'm missing some context here?

Astus said:

Yes, it is dao 道 translated as Way here. It has a wide variety of meanings in Buddhist texts.

A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms, William Edward Soothill and Lewis Hodous (excerpt)

A way, road; the right path; principle, Truth, Reason, Logos, Cosmic energy; to lead; to say.

佛教漢梵大辭典 (Chinese-Sanskrit Large Dictionary of Buddhism)

mārga, path, gati, pratipad; bodhi; bhikṣu; nyāya; adhvan, avacara, āśrama, gatika, gati-saṃdhi, caraṇa, carī, carī, caryā, jāti, dharma, naya, patha, pada, parāyaṇa, pratipatti, prahāṇa, bodhi-mārga, bhūmi, mārga-caraṇa, mārgaṇa, mārgatas, mārgatva, mārga-satya, yāna, rathyā, vartman, vidhi.

Malcolm wrote:

Then the question really is whether or not your reading "way" as "bodhi" is really justified.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 20th, 2016 at 3:15 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Iconoclast said:

I don't know....I'm Canadian.

DGA said:

are you laughing about ten years of Steve Harper?

Iconoclast said:

I was laughing at this forum filled with unattached enlighten ones.

Seriously though, there seems to be a lot of clinging to Leftest political utopian idealism.

Malcolm wrote:

This forum is filled with a lot of people of seriously left wing sentiments, for example, I score almost off the board as a leftist libertarian, YMMV. In the West, Buddhadharma is dominated by liberals and leftists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 20th, 2016 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Astus said:

"Studying the Way is to always contemplate the self-nature:

This is to be identical with all the buddhas."

(Platform Sutra, ch 7, p 53)

Malcolm wrote:

What does "this" refer to?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 20th, 2016 at 2:38 AM

Title: Re: The purpose of Aspiration prayers

Content:

Vasana said:

I'm looking for information on the purpose, or function of aspiration prayers, as well as your personal thoughts and experiences with them and the role they have played for you along the path.

Malcolm wrote:

More info can be found in Dasabhumika Sūtra. since pranidhana pāramitā is one of the ten.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 20th, 2016 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

jundo cohen said:

The Buddha is not ignorant, but we are ignorant for failing to see that we are Buddha all along and never ignorant.

Malcolm wrote:

Where there is ignorance, there is no buddhahood. Ignorances and Buddhas are mutually exclusive.

jundo cohen said:

Buddha needs no cultivation for nothing is lacking. Only our endless cultivation allow us to embody that we are Buddha with no need of cultivation and nothing lacking.

Malcolm wrote:

Attaining buddhahood was never an additive process to begin with. Rather than adding something missing, it is a removal of something extraneous.

jundo cohen said:

It is possible to "get it" once and for all such that there is not one more thing in need of doing. All is done, the journey ended. One realizes that there was never need for a journey to begin with for all was ever present and whole, and nothing in need of doing. It always was so.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, standard Mahāyāna, stated quite plainly by Maitreyanatha.

jundo cohen said:

And at that point, one is well advised to "get going" and bring it to life, get on with the journey, by the cultivation of every word, thought and act.

Malcolm wrote:

No, at this point, "there is not one more thing in need of doing."

jundo cohen said:

The end result is something like a journey in which every step is arrival in the Buddha Land, and yet we press on. It is cultivation in which we plant a seed, water and (most importantly) pull weeds ... and yet the flowers have all been in bloom all along.

Malcolm wrote:

In the end, your Zen is just standard Mahāyāna gussied up in polyester brocade.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: Klesha's

Content:

Pringle said:

I'm aware that Klesha's are 'defilements' or 'afflictions' that obscure the mind from seeing the true nature of things.

Malcolm wrote:

No, kleshas cause rebirth in the three realms.

The knowledge obscuration prevents us from seeing the true nature of things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 9:26 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Is that not how you tend to talk to people, Namdrol? You offer unbending opinions on Zen, Japanese clergy ...

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. My manner may be a bit direct, but I never tell people, that in essence, I think they are full of shit, everyone, but you that is — because you so frequently let others know you think they are completely full of shit in the most rude way. And this has been pointed out to you again and again, and not by me. And quite frankly, despite my directness, I have never been banned from a single forum anywhere ever, unlike you, who has even made yourself persona non grata at Zen forums.

If you had even the smidgen of the respect for other Buddhist schools that I do for Chan and Zen, you would never talk the way you do.

BTW, I don't confuse your online persona with your persona in real life. People in really life are not usually the prigs they present themselves as online.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 9:12 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

jundo cohen said:

The free flow of reasonable, civilly and calmly presented ideas should be allowed for true discussion and interchange to occur.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not possible when people like yourself greet every idea that does not conform to your concepts of reality with snorting derision that drips with condescension.

jundo cohen said:

However, ideas can be scary to some.

Malcolm wrote:

You have a mirror, why don't you use it for a change.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 9:03 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All perception, apart from direct perceptions, are necessarily conceptual because they are governed by universals imputed from the perception of particulars [for example, all cows are perceived as cows by virtue of everything else being a non-cow, anyāpoha]

Herbie said:

your protest is caused by your view which is not Gelug view but Sakya view. Gelug view does actually accept apoha view of Dignaga/Dharmakirti but its interpretation differs from Sakya view.

Malcolm wrote:

Um, no. My understanding is not based on Sakya texts. It is based on Indian texts.

An absence of inherent existence, your "object of negation" does not even exist conventionally,

if it would exist conventionally then worldly people would know emptiness

Since this inherent existence to be negated does not even exist conventionally, it is merely a concept to negate, i.e. a conceptual negation.

therefore, it cannot be perceived directly.

What is direct perception when there is no common inter-individual object as in prasangika?

Supposedly, according to the Gelug system, the absence of inherent existence is the nominal ultimate, which is cultivated in order to lead to the yogic direction perception of emptiness. But nominal ultimates are necessarily conceptual, and are sustained through a conceptual awareness.

It is a mere concept, like the color grue, which is entirely conceptual in nature.

Tsongkhapa, the philosopher, would totally agree: objects only exist dependent on conceptuality

Then why are you negating the fact that your "absence of inherent existence" is merely a concept? You are being self-contradictory [as usual]. Further, you are not making a distinction between that which is absolutely false, such as grue, or inherent existence, and that which is conventionally true, such as blue-green or existence.

It cannot even be perceived via exclusion [since inherent existence does not conventionally exist].

inherent existence actually conventionally exists because people think it to inhere in objects of perception.

No, inherent existence does not exist even conventionally. If it did, Tsongkhapa would not have negated it, because it would be an over-negation. The reason why Tsongkhapa negates inherent existence rather than existence is because the former does not exist even conventionally, while the latter does.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 7:30 PM

Title: Re: Hello . . .

Content:

Bhikkhu_YinRi said:

Hello everyone. Rather new to forums.

How is everyone.

Malcolm wrote:

Give up hope, all ye who enter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 7:20 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is just a poetic restatement of Nāgārjuna's trope about the non differentiation of samsara and nirvana, but it does not address the core of my point.

Astus said:

Your point seems to be that afflictions need to be fully eliminated first, and only then one has attained full enlightenment. But Huineng says:

"If one [tries to] use the illumination of wisdom to destroy the afflictions, this is the

interpretation of the two [Hinayana] vehicles [held by] those fit for the sheep and deer [carts]. ... Ordinary people see brightness and ignorance as different, but the wise comprehend that they are nondual in their nature. ... One abides in the afflictions without disruption; one resides in meditation without serenity. Not annihilationist and not permanent, neither coming nor going; neither located in an intermediate location nor in the internal and external; neither generated nor extinguished, permanently abiding without movement—this is called the Way."
(Platform Sutra, ch 10, BDK Edition, p 80)

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhas are not on a way. They have reached their destination.

And no, I don't mean that one hunts afflictions like a cat hunting mice. Those who are incapable of instant buddhahood naturally burn off the two obscurations over many lifetimes as a result their practice of gathering the two accumulations, unless of course they have access to special means.

Once upon a time, first bhumi realization was common, now it has become very rare.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 11:08 AM

Title: Re: Nāda yoga ~ Sound as Path ~ Sutra, Tantra, Mantra, Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Six Lamps and its commentary.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Awesome, thanks!

tomamundsen said:

I think <https://www.amazon.com/Naked-Seeing-Perfection-Visionary-Renaissance/dp/0199982910> has a translation of that. Not sure if there are other English translations available?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 11:04 AM

Title: Re: What's lineage, what is it for, & how does it work?

Content:

dreambow said:

1). I can drink.
2). I get groomed.
3). I go for a walk.
...I AM THE STALLION

DGA Where does that above quote or insert come from?

DGA said:

It's from a silly song called "The Stallion (part two)." It's about someone who is a pompous fool--the kind who invents preposterous reasons to believe he's better than everyone else. I made it my signature to celebrate someone's birthday (Aaron Freeman, the guy who wrote it), and I forgot to change it. It's brown for a reason, too, but we don't have to get into that.

Malcolm wrote:

Even sillier:

```
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]
```

Dog goes woof, cat goes meow.
Bird goes tweet, and mouse goes squeak.
Cow goes moo. Frog goes croak, and the elephant goes toot.
Ducks say quack and fish go blub, and the seal goes OW OW OW.
But there's one sound that no one knows...
WHAT DOES THE FOX SAY?
Ring-ding-ding-ding-dingeringeding!
Gering-ding-ding-ding-dingeringeding!
Gering-ding-ding-ding-dingeringeding!
WHAT THE FOX SAY?
Wa-pa-pa-pa-pa-pow!
Wa-pa-pa-pa-pa-pow!
Wa-pa-pa-pa-pa-pow!
WHAT THE FOX SAY?
Hatee-hatee-hatee-ho!
Hatee-hatee-hatee-ho!
Hatee-hatee-hatee-ho!
WHAT THE FOX SAY?
Joff-tchoff-tchoff-tchoffo-tchoffo-tchoff!
Joff-tchoff-tchoff-tchoffo-tchoffo-tchoff!
Joff-tchoff-tchoff-tchoffo-tchoffo-tchoff!
WHAT THE FOX SAY?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 11:03 AM

Title: Re: Hara

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Pending some actual evidence for the existence of "Hara", I would still take it as a useful and powerful phenomenon just on peoples' faith and belief alone, even if there is nothing there. In that way, it is still useful.

dharmagoat said:

Indeed, as can be said of many aspects of Buddhism.

I am constantly surprised by how many Buddhists require an absolute existence of such things.

Malcolm wrote:

Silly goat, it is the hypogastric plexus, as I mentioned above. This is just a channel system, it arises with the body, and perishes with it too.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 10:57 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Caodemarte said:

...so different from much the childish sect bashing...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it would be nice if jundo refrained from doing that, but that would be like coal turning white.

Caodemarte said:

Zen Buddhism is part of the Mahayana tradition, and would regard itself as teaching true Mahayana Buddhism (as would other sects).

Malcolm wrote:

Oh for lord's sake. I am a Dzogchen practitioner, that means, among other things, that I accept that Chan is based on definitive sūtras, as opposed to the gradual path advocated by Kamalashila in the Bhavanakrama.

Caodemarte said:

What do you mean by "Are there any Zen sources that describe what Buddhahood is, in an externally verifiable way?" Do you mean the idea, sometimes taken literally that a Buddha has distinct, unusual marks that can be physically measured? "I am an ordinary guy, buddha was an ordinary guy, and so are you. We are all also Buddha." is one Zen response to that.

Malcolm wrote:

This is just a poetic restatement of Nāgārjuna's trope about the non differentiation of samsara and nirvana, but it does not address the core of my point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 6:42 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For example, when you say "I have refuted inherent existence" what you have done is engage in a conceptual exercise.

Herbie said:

yes, if you merely refute, this is merely a conceptual operation. But if you perceive its absence as a consequence of not projecting it then you have negated "the object of negation" for yourself. Communicating this to others may be more or less appropriate and therefore lead to more or less justified rejections by others.

Malcolm wrote:

All perception, apart from direct perceptions, are necessarily conceptual because they are governed by universals imputed from the perception of particulars [for example, all cows are perceived as cows by virtue of everything else being a non-cow, anyāpoha].

An absence of inherent existence, your "object of negation" does not even exist conventionally, therefore, it cannot be perceived directly. It is a mere concept, like the color grue, which is entirely conceptual in nature. It cannot even be perceived via exclusion [since inherent existence does not conventionally exist].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Herbie said:

But then ... this is perhaps where the "religious element" comes in which is represented by the concept of the bodhisattva bhūmis. Because if one perceives the object of negation for the first time one necessarily perceives emptiness - at least indirectly - for the first time.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you just perceive another conceptual construct.

Herbie said:

No, because the object of negation is the object observed by means of introspection. you should not confuse the concept with its referent: when I say or write "sweet" the concept "sweet" is valid although nobody has the taste of sweetness in their mouths

when reading/seeing the word "sweet". Same applies to "object of negation".

Malcolm wrote:

An object of negation is a conceptual construct. For example, when you say "I have refuted inherent existence" what you have done is engage in a conceptual exercise since there is no referent at all, since unlike "sweet" inherent existence does not exist even conventionally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: Nāda yoga ~ Sound as Path ~ Sutra,Tantra,Mantra,Dzogchen

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Do you have a particular (non restricted, or mildly) text you'd recommend in terms of this?

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN discusses sound, light and rays all the time. IN Buddhist Dzogchen it is mainly confined to discussions of the bardo experience.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Yeah, I remember some of that from Crystal and the Way of Light..I meant a Bonpo text specifically,if you had a recommendation.

Malcolm wrote:

The Six Lamps and its commentary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 4:51 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Lukeinaz said:

Is this something that once felt will always be remembered?

Herbie said:

Principally yes, BUT all habits must become aware as mere habits and if one gets again lost in the habits that one once has recognized as mere habits these habits again appear as truths.

But then ... this is perhaps where the "religious element" comes in which is represented by the concept of the bodhisattva bhūmis. Because if one perceives the object of negation for the first time one necessarily perceives emptiness - at least indirectly - for the first time.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you just perceive another conceptual construct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Nāda yoga ~ Sound as Path ~ Sutra,Tantra,Mantra,Dzogchen

Content:

Panaesthesia said:

This then makes sense, for me, of what Guan Yin said in the Surangama sutra about the stage he went through at which "sound ended." I'm writing up a fuller explanation of that and why it is relevant to this meditation support, which I'll post sometime in the future on my blog.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to discover the sound of dharmatā. Then there is nothing left to understand about sound.

The Bon po Dzogchen Zhang Zhung sNyan rGyud teachings about sound, lights and rays are also very interesting and detailed. More detailed than what is "Buddhist" Dzogchen.

Johnny Dangerous said:

Do you have a particular (non restricted, or mildly) text you'd recommend in terms of this?

Malcolm wrote:

ChNN discusses sound, light and rays all the time. IN Buddhist Dzogchen it is mainly confined to discussions of the bardo experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: Nāda yoga ~ Sound as Path ~ Sutra,Tantra,Mantra,Dzogchen

Content:

Panaesthesia said:

This then makes sense, for me, of what Guan Yin said in the Surangama sutra about the stage he went through at which "sound ended." I'm writing up a fuller explanation of that and why it is relevant to this meditation support, which I'll post sometime in the future on my blog.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to discover the sound of dharmatā. Then there is nothing left to understand about sound.

The Bon po Dzogchen Zhang Zhung sNyan rGyud teachings about sound, lights and rays

are also very interesting and detailed. More detailed than what is "Buddhist" Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: Hara

Content:

Pero said:

Hara/dantien is quite real (though the meaning is different in different contexts). But it's something that has to be built (this goes for both some (internal) martial arts as well as some Daoist practices, don't know about its importance in Zen).

jundo cohen said:

I wonder what proof there is that it is real. I do not mean anecdotal proof, such as "I feel something when I concentrate there." I mean concrete proof for its existence. Can it be found in the human anatomy?

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abdominal_aortic_plexus

It roughly corresponds to this. More precisely, it is the hypogastric plexus, located in most people about four finger widths below the navel in the center of the abdomen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Hara

Content:

jundo cohen said:

I know that Meido is looking in here, and as a martial artist and Zen priest he will have a lot more to say than I will.

I believe that hara/tanden is largely a fiction

Malcolm wrote:

Because your opinions on what is real and unreal are so highly regarded around here...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Awareness

Content:

rachmiel said:

Anyone else -- who knows about Buddhist vs. Vedantic takes on awareness -- find the OP to be accurate, off, on the right track, etc.?

Malcolm wrote:

The inseparable clarity and emptiness of the mind is regarded as ultimate. Mipham explains very clearly in Original Mind:

Beyond the extremes of conditioned and unconditioned, in the true stage of things, an emptiness devoid of luminosity cannot be perceived and a luminous mind devoid of emptiness cannot be perceived. When those two are realized as the objects of a personal knowledge of the realization of the true state, they are realized to be inseparable. If it is not realized, since the theoretical understanding arising in the mind that there is an empty object which is the demarcation of an object of refutation through exclusion and a subjective consciousness that possesses signs does not go beyond grasping signified phenomena that are conceptual objects of dualistic appearances as being real or unreal, it is not the true state. If the true state, original mind, is actualized, there will be personal knowledge of the nondual dharmatā that goes beyond the domain of all dualistic phenomena such as real or unreal, empty or not empty, and so on. [20/a] In that case, the division of emptiness, luminosity, knowing and emptiness, appearance and emptiness into dualities are mere expressions that does not stay in the partial extremes because of subsequent concepts, but there is no duality in the true state. Likewise, it is beyond all dualistic phenomena such as subject, object, and so on... Apart from actualizing this on the basis of the intimate instruction of the liberating method that possesses the yoga, it is not an object of analysis with intellectual knowledge. Therefore, it is valid to have confidence in those who have ascertained their own minds are nonarising. However, only foolish children assert that unconditioned sole emptiness turned into an object with the conditioned mind is the true state. Since not even a semblance of personal knowledge arises, since nothing is able to arising in the mind other than that, since one can be seduced by turning it into a conceptual tenet, give up looking in that direction. It is necessary to hear the instruction of the profound aural lineage from the mouth of the sublime vidyādhara gurus who follow the tenets of the Great Perfection or Mahāmudra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: What's lineage, what is it for, & how does it work?

Content:

Rishin said:

Sorry folks but I have some more questions.

From what I've seen in the thread there are obviously levels of practice which one goes

through after ordination. So with that in mind is it fair to assume that even ordained practitioners have continual training and a teacher?

DGA said:

Yes.

In Tendai-shu (this may be generalized across all Japanese traditions, but I'm not certain), one is ordained first, and then trained afterward. Ordination in this case isn't like a diploma. It's what you do when you first start out. The kinds of training one will be expected to engage in varies from tradition to tradition, and also from temple to temple within traditions.

Malcolm wrote:

In Tibet, receiving the three vows [Hinyāna, Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna] are not considered ordinations [aside from ordaining (pravajyā) as a novice or fully ordained monk or nun] at all. And all three come with any empowerment one might attend.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 19th, 2016 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The nonconceptual equipoise on emptiness. When you are in nonconceptual equipoise on emptiness, the latent afflictions which cause rebirth in the three realms are gradually burned away.

Astus said:

So you mean immunity in the sense that they are not activated, therefore they do not even come up to one's consciousness. But then, because they are latent, they are not active except in the right conditions anyway.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, until they are burnt away, one can still take birth in the three realms. Buddhas do not take birth in the three realms at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2016 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Perhaps if you philosophize about these things so much you create complexity, distance, separation from Buddha, trouble, confusion.

Malcolm wrote:

Your notion that simple, straight forward things are "philosophy" merely point to your

lack of education in matters Dharmic. We are not discussing Madhyamaka here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2016 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Iconoclast said:

Is it theft for a Buddhist government to impose taxes upon the unwilling?

kirtu said:

What is it with Americas (presumably - but not necessarily - could be some English too) and the hatred of taxes? "theft to impose taxes upon the unwilling" ??? For whom do the conjunction of those concepts make sense?

Kirt

Queequeg said:

Because our country (usa) got started as a protest against paying taxes (without representation)? And then when we got our own country, we immediately had an uprising when we tried to collect taxes ourselves (Whiskey Rebellion). Not wanting to pay taxes is as American as the 4th of July.

Malcolm wrote:

No one likes taxes, but like death, they are inevitable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2016 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: What's lineage, what is it for, & how does it work?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Dudjom Lingpa never studied Dzogchen with a human lama...

Malcolm wrote:

I don't know why people keep on repeating this falsehood. It simply isn't true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2016 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Pardon me for saying, but the very fact that you (and perhaps Malcolm) think there is "contradiction" and "they can't be reconciled" is pretty much why you don't "get" Zen

Teachings, if you ask me. This is perhaps THE mystery that opens into clarity for us.

Malcolm wrote:

Do you really think we are such idiots that we do not understand tathāgatagarbha theory?

jundo cohen said:

Well, I do not call anyone an idiot. However, something seems to be off key in some of what is said here.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, some people's gross addiction to bullshit rhetoric and disingenuous oratory.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2016 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are two kinds of afflictions: kleśas and anuśaya; the former is active; the latter, dormant or inactive. By the end of the seventh bhumi all afflictions are totally eradicated, leaving only the knowledge obscuration, which is like an increasingly sheer veil.

Astus said:

What is immunity to afflictions then?

Malcolm wrote:

The nonconceptual equipoise on emptiness. When you are in nonconceptual equipoise on emptiness, the latent afflictions which cause rebirth in the three realms are gradually burned away. Of course, if like some here, you do not accept rebirth, than Buddhadharma altogether just bullshit and the only possible reason you could be interested in it is for some nice relaxation meditation. But maybe a massage with a happy ending would be better.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2016 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Pardon me for saying, but the very fact that you (and perhaps Malcolm) think there is "contradiction" and "they can't be reconciled" is pretty much why you don't "get" Zen Teachings, if you ask me. This is perhaps THE mystery that opens into clarity for us.

Malcolm wrote:

Do you really think we are such idiots that we do not understand tathāgatagarbha theory?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2016 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Right, this simply means that you are immune to the afflictions that you possess, not that you have eradicated them.

Astus said:

Do you mean "non-afflictive ignorance" / jneyavarana with immunity to afflictions? Otherwise, an affliction that does not afflict is not an affliction.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two kinds of afflictions: kleśas and anuśaya; the former is active; the latter, dormant or inactive. By the end of the seventh bhumi all afflictions are totally eradicated, leaving only the knowledge obscuration, which is like an increasingly sheer veil.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2016 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Astus, if one still has afflictions, one is on the path of cultivation, at best. Buddhas have no afflictions, so Huineng's statement is pointing to ārya practitioners, not buddhas. Buddhas have no enervating afflictions to worry about at all, because they have been eradicated [by the eighth bhumi].

Astus said:

The teaching was addressed to a mixed group of lay and ordained people, so the audience should be considered ordinary beings, who all attain enlightenment at the end of the speech. The quote says that with the realisation of the sudden teaching the afflictions will be eliminated.

Here's the BTTS translation: "When you become enlightened to the Sudden Teaching, you do not grasp onto the cultivation of external things. When your own mind constantly gives rise to right views, afflictions and defilement can never stain you. That is what is meant by seeing your own nature." (若開悟頓教，不能外修，但於自心常起正見，煩惱塵勞常不能染，即是見性。)

Malcolm wrote:

Right, this simply means that you are immune to the afflictions that you possess, not that you have eradicated them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2016 at 9:43 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

DGA said:

Malcolm, would you please summarize the characteristics of someone who has attained the path of seeing?

Malcolm wrote:

They are capable of giving away their limbs without a second thought to anyone who needs them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2016 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Stay cool, don't get upset. Nobody is criticizing the Vajrayana. I am criticizing your presentation of the Vajrayana and great misunderstanding of Zen.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not talking about Vajrayāna, nor presenting it.

jundo cohen said:

The is what the Buddha taught in India, what the Buddha taught sometimes, what the Buddha taught to those who could not handle other truths, what the Buddha did not teach ... but there is also what the Buddha Taught! Can you hear that?

Malcolm wrote:

What I hear from you is more rhetoric and sad sloganeering by an ordinary guy who acts out his afflictions every day, all day. Start over, Jundo, find another teacher. Study with someone like Meido.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2016 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Wayfarer said:

So, are you saying there's no possibility that you're not 'off a hair'?

Astus said:

I don't think this is a topic about me, even if it is a common trend to turn everything into personal matters.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it is about you, Astus. If it is not about what you personally experience, it is just stale and dead words.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2016 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So then, apparently the solution is to always remain seated, in equipoise [que obligatory rhetoric about being neither seated nor not seated, neither view nor nonview, neither equipoise nor nonequipoise, blah blah blah.]

jundo cohen said:

Hi Malcolm,

I believe that you say this because you do not understand and are trapped in divided thinking.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahahahahha, Jundo. Nothing could be further from the truth.

jundo cohen said:

In Zen one can learn to sit while sitting and sit while standing and moving.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, que rhetoric...the problem is rhetoric, Jundo.

jundo cohen said:

The reality is that the bhumis do not measure realization [this is a much misunderstood point], they measure qualities.

One realizes that which has all qualities and no qualities, and in which All Qualities and Signs of a Buddha are realized (and always were) right at the heart of Samsara, right as your heart too.

Malcolm wrote:

que rhetoric...again, how sad. A chance to say something meaningful squandered in blind sloganeering.

jundo cohen said:

The five paths are the measures of realization, and for āryas, there are three: the path of seeing [mounting the first bhumi], the path of cultivation [bhumis 1-10], and finally, the path of no more training [buddhahood].

This is blah blah blah that is a creation of your own mind.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually, the Buddha taught it.

jundo cohen said:

Not a single one of us is in reality a Buddha

Of course we are! And you would see as clearly as day if we were not for blinded ignorance and divided thinking.

Malcolm wrote:

No Jundo, you prove your non-Buddhahood every day when you come to the defense of Zen, cast aspersions about Vajrayāna, etc. As any game theorist will tell you, the only way to win is not to play. You might want to take a page out of Meido's playbook. At least he is mature.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2016 at 9:15 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Astus said:

"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.

Malcolm wrote:

Astus, if one still has afflictions, one is on the path of cultivation, at best. Buddhas have no afflictions, so Huineng's statement is pointing to ārya practitioners, not buddhas. Buddhas have no enervating afflictions to worry about at all, because they have been eradicated [by the eighth bhumi].

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2016 at 9:07 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

jundo cohen said:

In one traditional Zen Buddhist take on the 10 Bhumis, all are realized at once in the Emptiness of a moment of sudden realization or in a moment of Zazen. Since there was no where to get, and the ladder was Empty, the 10 Bhumis are Empty. As Taigen Dan Leighton notes on Dogen and the appearance of the underground Bodhisattvas in the Lotus Sutra ...

Malcolm wrote:

So then, apparently the solution is to always remain seated, in equipoise [que obligatory rhetoric about being neither seated nor not seated, neither view nor nonview, neither equipoise nor nonequipoise, blah blah blah.]

The reality is that the bhumis do not measure realization [this is a much misunderstood point], they measure qualities.

The five paths are the measures of realization, and for āryas, there are three: the path of seeing [mounting the first bhumi], the path of cultivation [bhumis 1-10], and finally, the path of no more training [buddhahood].

It appears to me that in some quarters, there is an excessive commitment in Zen/Chan to a rhetoric of immediacy, to borrow Faure's term, which results in a rather pyrrhic discourse of "all or nothingism" by people who have realized nothing at all. Not a single one of us is in reality a Buddha, and I find it odd that people without a single shred of noble realization present themselves as authorities on a buddhahood [i.e. Zen masters] they have never experienced.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2016 at 11:23 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Traditional Medicine

Content:

TaTa said:

Malcom where are you based? (country)

Malcolm wrote:

US

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2016 at 10:01 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Caodemarte said:

In Korean Zen there is a still continuing debate about Sudden Enlightenment/Gradual Cultivation vs. Sudden Enlightenment/Sudden Cultivation.

Malcolm wrote:

These controversies are nonissues, and they exist in Tibetan Buddhism as well, most notably in Dzogchen, where we argue that the result that does not come from a cause, buddhahood does not come from mind, and our intimate instruction does not come from a text [because it is based on direct perception].

The issue boils down to capacity of an individual practitioner, and no abstract theory can make someone a buddha. The real point in having these kinds of discussions is to make it clear that theories are not practice. The sudden awakening theory of Huineng is fine, but the kind of people who fully awaken in an instant are quite rare — as it was observed by a 12 century Dzogchen master, he looked high and low for a cig char wa, a suddenly enlightened buddha, but apart from the founder of Mahāmudra in India, Saraha, and the founder of the Drugpa Kagyu lineage, Ling Repa, he never met anyone who he could say was fully awakened, a buddha, suddenly. Such people are as rare as stars seen at noon.

I personally have no issue with the notion of someone attaining full awakening in an instant [the doctrine the Lanka is actually famous for and the reason it should be considered the foundational document of Chan], cutting through both obscurations at once, I merely doubt that it happens very frequently, maybe as frequently as an udumbara flower blossoms. In other words Chan rhetoric is fine, but I don't think the rhetoric matches people's practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2016 at 9:47 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

DGA said:

I think if you understand "equipoise" in the sense Malcolm does, which is the recognition of one's Buddha-nature, then my question about the Danxia quotation makes sense.

Astus said:

Seeing buddha-nature is being a buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Here, you are being dishonest, since you have written elsewhere many times that as far as you are concerned, buddhanature and emptiness are one and the same.

If however by buddhanature you mean dharmakāya, well, than yes, only buddhas can see that. But your language is so imprecise as to be deceptive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2016 at 9:44 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are two kinds of realization, conceptual and non-conceptual. The realization of common people is the former, the realization of āryas, the latter. If this point is not well understood, not only will one err with regard to the path practiced by common people such as ourselves, but also the path of āryas will not be well understood.

Caodemarte said:

In Korean Zen there is a still continuing debate about Sudden Enlightenment/Gradual Cultivation vs. Sudden Enlightenment/Sudden Cultivation As I understand, in the latter position "initial awakenings" are not considered as awakenings at all, only "profound awakenings" count as awakenings. So "initial awakenings" are hardly denied, but not defined as true awakening by this group. At this point, the real debate with the Chinul influenced Sudden Enlightenment/Gradual Cultivation school begins, but is far too sophisticated for my pay grade, especially as it makes little difference in actual training (the most famous modern advocate of Sudden Enlightenment/Sudden Cultivation was known for his exceptionally hard post-enlightenment practice) and seems more of an "ontological" concern than a soteriological.

Meido said:

Nice, thank you.

Something overlooked in these discussions perhaps is that kind of fluidity with which the two supposedly rigidly opposed camps actually approach practice. For example post-kensho practice in Rinzai practice could be called gradual from one standpoint, but is actually experienced in terms of sudden leap-overs. The 5 Ranks are commonly considered a map of graduated progression, but within the practice tradition they're engaged with primarily as different ways of expressing realization, not as grades or steps.

Oral instruction - either living, or preserved in writings not publicly shared - is still a crucial part (to my mind, the crucial part) of what actually goes on in much of Zen.

~ Meido

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 18th, 2016 at 9:40 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is exactly the distinction between an ārya's equipoise and post-equipoise. When in equipoise, one is in a state of realization, when not, then not, and one's

realization remains at the level of a concept.

Astus said:

There is a difference between the two in that one can go in and out of equipoise, but realisation of buddha-nature is once and for ever (except for those advocating a sudden enlightenment followed by gradual practice system). So Danxia says, "Just eat and drink. Everyone can do that. Don't harbor doubt."

Malcolm wrote:

Once you realize emptiness, yes, then one's eventual buddhahood is assured. However, the realization of emptiness is not sufficient for buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: What's lineage, what is it for, & how does it work?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

I know my ancestors back a few generations, but can you name your Grand Grand Grand Parents?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, on one side [paternal-matrilineal] back to the 9th century [Macnab clan], on another side [paternal-patrilineal] back to 15th century [D' Estes/Borgia], and on the other [maternal-matrilineal/patrilineal] to the 17th century [Engemons/Clan Hunter] and probably further.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

DGA said:

From the perspective of one in a state of equipoise, there is no progression. From the perspective of one in a state of affliction, there is progression.

Astus said:

Such a distinction between equipoise and post-equipoise is not used in Chan. Rather, consider the third line from the <http://terebeess.hu/english/hsin.html>: "Be off by a hair, And you are as far from it as heaven from earth." (毫釐有差天地懸隔) Dogen writes exactly the same in https://web.stanford.edu/group/scbs/sztp3/translations/gongyo_seiten/translations/part_3/fukan_zazengi.html: "And yet, if there is a hairsbreadth deviation, it is like the gap between heaven and earth." (然而毫釐有差天地懸隔) That is, you have either realised buddha-nature or not.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is exactly the distinction between an ārya's equipoise and post-equipoise. When in equipoise, one is in a state of realization, when not, then not, and one's realization remains at the level of a concept. For ordinary people, all their realization remains at a conceptual level.

And then of course we see all the blundering and errors of Zen masters in the west, people who have been declared by their lineage to be Buddhas. What can we possibly think of such a thing? Are Tibetan buddhist masters exempt from criticism on the same grounds? Of course not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

DGA said:

My frame of reference here is Seung Sahn Sunim's Compass of Zen. But I think the first quotation you give in this post, the one by Moguja, articulates it succinctly.

Astus said:

Seung Sahn used a circle to describe a practitioner's progress. It goes gradually up to fully realising buddha-nature, so it's more like gradual practice, sudden enlightenment. Otherwise, he says in Compass of Zen when describing the purpose of Buddhism:

"If attain your mind—which means, if you attain your true self—then you become Buddha." (p 16)

"When you attain your true self, you become Buddha. But Buddha is not something special, and it is not something outside you. Buddha means that if you attain your true self, you attain your own mind." (p 25)

Malcolm wrote:

We all know how that worked out for Seung Sahn.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Temicco said:

I don't know of any Chan texts that actually teach the two obscurations... Astus' characterization of the tradition is quite correct. You could probably argue that from a Tibetan perspective, orthodox Chan enlightenment is either a) incomplete, or b) asking a whole lot of its practitioners (anuttara-samyak sambodhi in this life being nbd), but neither of these ideas are really present within classical Chan literature. I think it would

be a mistake to apply Tibetan conceptions of enlightenment upon Chan, instead of taking it on its own terms.

Malcolm wrote:

I am quite certain that Chan Buddhism contains the teachings about karma and knowledge obscurations. Why? Because they are discussed at length in the Lanka sūtra. Or has the Lankāvatāra Sūtra been demoted?

M

Temicco said:

It does indeed, but there's a couple things I think should be considered here.

In my eyes, Chan doesn't make a big deal out of obscurations like Vajrayana seems to. In sudden enlightenment, sudden cultivation schools (the orthodox Chan position), the only enlightenment discussed is anuttara samyak sambodhi. There's nothing to do after enlightenment; no obscurations to remove. Gradualist systems are acknowledged as valid, but the classical Chan position itself is vehemently sudden and utterly complete. Recognizing the nature of mind is said to be sufficient for this aim. As such, Chan is less concerned about discussing these defilements than Vajrayana seems to be. So outside the sutras (which Chan has a love-hate relationship with anyway), defilements are only really talked about when it comes to how students should conduct themselves.

Malcolm wrote:

This all ignores the most august and respected classical system of the five ranks, which are easily mappable to the scheme of five paths in classical Indian Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 9:55 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It does not matter much what it is called, the fact is that buddhahood requires the elimination of the two obscurations. That does not happen in one lifetime, in general.

Temicco said:

I don't know of any Chan texts that actually teach the two obscurations... Astus' characterization of the tradition is quite correct. You could probably argue that from a Tibetan perspective, orthodox Chan enlightenment is either a) incomplete, or b) asking a whole lot of its practitioners (anuttara-samyak sambodhi in this life being nbd), but neither of these ideas are really present within classical Chan literature. I think it would be a mistake to apply Tibetan conceptions of enlightenment upon Chan, instead of taking it on its own terms.

Malcolm wrote:

I am quite certain that Chan Buddhism contains the teachings about karma and

knowledge obscurations. Why? Because they are discussed at length in the Lanka sūtra. Or has the Lankāvatāra Sūtra been demoted?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 8:51 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not the case. There is a distinction between equipoise and post-equipoise which exists right up to the last moment of the tenth bhumi.

tomamundsen said:

Would this be in the Madhyamakavatara? Or somewhere else?

Malcolm wrote:

Dasabhumika sūtra, among other places.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 8:49 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Astus, what Huineng says is nothing special. The realization of a first stage bodhisattva is the same wisdom a Buddha fully realizes. The difference between an ārya bodhisattva and buddha is whether or not that realization is sustained 24/7/365. Bodhisattvas have equipoise and post-equipoise phases, where they may still act out afflictively. Buddhas are only in equipoise.

What accounts for this is that veil of twin obscurations a bodhisattva must burn away with diligent practice, and of course, in every lifetime, bodhisattvas on the impure stages regress completely to the level of common persons, and need to begin again, albeit, advancing more rapidly. It is only when they reach the eighth bhumi that this regression ceases and they attain power over birth.

Astus said:

What you say is called in Zen "sudden enlightenment, gradual practice".

Malcolm wrote:

It does not matter much what it is called, the fact is that buddhahood requires the elimination of the two obscurations. That does not happen in one lifetime, in general.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 4:20 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Poor Jundo, retreating into religiosity when his rationality is challenged, not to mention his scholarship...

DGA said:

As the old law-school chestnut goes:

If you have the law on your side, pound on the law.

if you have the facts, then pound on the facts.

If you have neither the law nor the facts, pound on the table.

In this thread, the "table" has been insinuations of sectarianism, bigotry, fundamentalism, and so on.

Malcolm wrote:

The table was quite old and fragile...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 4:18 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 said:

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.

Anders said:

actually, 7th stage bodhisattvas are in fulltime in that department.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not the case. There is a distinction between equipoise and post-equipoise

which exists right up to the last moment of the tenth bhumi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

I could (but will not) comment on how the decadence, doctrinal errors and outdated thinking of other Buddhist Traditions are doing even greater harms to Buddhism, and we could begin to compare "woeful state" to "woeful state" one to one.

DGA said:

This is a passive-aggressive way of making a claim without actually demonstrating it. But since you are speaking in a hypothetical here: if you did feel you could write with a free hand, in a hypothetical situation only, which "doctrinal errors" and decadence and outdated thinking would you point to as doing "even greater harms to Buddhism"?

For myself, I'm intrigued by the outdated notion of "modernity," modernization, and updating the teachings to match a modern sensibility (whatever that may mean). When I see this idea raised, I'm reminded that the author of it must be of a certain age, because that idea has a certain vintage. And it has caused real harm to Buddhists and to the practice of Buddhism. Here's my reference on that.

<http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199756285.001.0001/acprof-9780199756285>

Malcolm wrote:

Poor Jundo, retreating into religiosity when his rationality is challenged, not to mention his scholarship...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: How appearances arise

Content:

monktastic said:

This is a section from Thrangu Rinpoche's "Pointing Out the Dharmakaya."

It's a lot like dreaming. So, to use a dream as an example, when you start to dream, the dream begins as a thought, like one you would have in the daytime. But you're asleep, so the thought intensifies and becomes something like talk or gossip, and then the gossip intensifies or solidifies into images, and then you really think that you're seeing people, seeing places, going places, and so on. And that is how it works with conventional appearances as well.

Is there a more detailed explanation of this process available anywhere?

Malcolm wrote:

In Mahāmudra, not so much. In Dzogchen, it is described in the topic of how sentient beings become deluded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

I know you are sincere.

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:

And so the great Zen master admits defeat.

jundo cohen said:

I know you are sincere.

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:

There is just no way I am going to let you have the last word, so this will go on for some time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 2:53 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

BTW, there's another translation of this text available, published by Shang Shung:

<https://www.amazon.com/Ornament-Thought-Nagarjuna-Clarifying-Madhyamaka/dp/B005KJUHQI>

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, but Lopez's is better.

Mother's Lap said:

Does Chopel offer anything different from Mipham is his critiques?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes. I think so. He offers an insiders critique of Gelug view, that is not dependent on Mipham, contrary to TK fans erroneous assertion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

jundo cohen said:

In my impression, not with this style and analysis and philosophical tangle.

However, he had a poetic tangle of another sort.

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:

As I recall from my reading, he was pretty straight forward about these issues.

The above, by the way, is neither philosophical nor tangled, and is also straight forward, not complicated, easy to understand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But what I do have is a lot of training in Indian and Tibetan polemics, including Buddhist epistemology, as well as a lot of systematic training in Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts, and if you are willing to admit that you don't want to debate me because you lack the expertise in the "case law" as it were, I am ok with that. That would be an honest admission on your part. But to dismiss it as mere religious debate, mere matters of opinion, that is disingenuous.

jundo cohen said:

I know you are sincere.

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:

And so the great Zen master admits defeat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Matt J said:

Thanks, everyone. I've gone back over the first 1/3 of the Adornment for Nagajuna's thought and now I'm completely paralyzed.

Malcolm wrote:

Happy to oblige...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Tibetan style debating does follow its own insular, arcane and circular rules of proof and logic, so no reason to engage. What's the point? I went to Duke Law School for 3 years, won a few in Federal Appeals Court. I am not that concerned to jump around smacking palms, arguing angels on the head of a pin with you.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it really doesn't. You are confusing Tibetan debate courts [a training program, not dissimilar to how law is taught today] with debate as a general scholarly practice in Indo-Tibetan Buddhism which goes back to Nāgārjuna and beyond.

As in arguing a case before a judge, you have to understand the case law, precedents, rulings and so in yes?

So too, in Buddhist philosophical debate one must be acquainted with the subject matter at hand.

Now, that said, I would never pretend I was competent to act as a lawyer. I don't have the training.

But what I do have is a lot of training in Indian and Tibetan polemics, including Buddhist epistemology, as well as a lot of systematic training in Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts, and if you are willing to admit that you don't want to debate me because you lack the expertise in the "case law" as it were, I am ok with that. That would be an honest admission on your part. But to dismiss it as mere religious debate, mere matters of opinion, that is disingenuous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Iconoclast said:

Is this a Buddhist perspective of your personal view...which Buddhist teaching helped you to arrive at this conclusion?

Malcolm wrote:

A study of the Buddhist codes of personal conduct, in which, for example, when a Buddhist monk violates the laws of a kingdom, he is turned over to that kingdom for prosecution. It has been long acquiesced in Buddhism that a Buddhist is generally obligated to obey the laws of the country they choose to live in. For this reason, there is very little written in Buddhism on government and politics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

conebeckham said:

It seems to me that Jundo is arguing for cultural adaptation over Buddhavacana.

Malcolm wrote:

Jundo is not arguing, he is struggling to stay in the game....which is why he so repetitive...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Thank you, but I decline. I honor your Traditions and Beliefs, and leave you to them.

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:

You see, Jundo, in Tibetan Buddhism we have a very rich tradition of debate. There is not a single doctrine or a single school that goes unchallenged or undebated, and these debates continue to the present day. One famous monk, Ganden Chopel, even proved that Buddha was not enlightened (of course some other monks beat the shit out of him later) on the debate floor in the mid 1920's in Lhasa.

However, the reality is that in general, in the Buddhist world, Buddhist thought in general ossified in the 15th century, world-wide, until it encountered the West.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Iconoclast said:

Could you cite a text for someone new (me) to the study of Buddhism? Is it theft for a Buddhist government to impose taxes upon the unwilling? Is there a Buddhist text about how to govern? This opens up questions about the nature of Buddhist texts, there acceptance, authority, inspiration, etc. but I'll have to ask in another forum.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as the "unwilling." If you live in a country from which you receive services, you pay taxes, you have to. If the Gvt. is doing things that violate your conscience, there is tax protest, but that is different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

I could (but will not) comment on how the decadence, doctrinal errors and outdated thinking of other Buddhist Traditions are doing even greater harms to Buddhism, and we could begin to compare "woeful state" to "woeful state" one to one.

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually, you can't. You lack the necessary scholarship. But should you want to, by all means, lets start a thread on it and see how you fare.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Iconoclast said:

Does it increase another's suffering if you force them to give up their wealth, property, etc? If someone is blissfully ignorant due to their wealth and status...wouldn't it be evil to force them to do something? Just thinking out loud...do Buddhist countries tend to be Left learning? Does the Dharma change or can it be altered for the greater political good? Does Buddhism allow for the use of force or threat, for that's what the government uses

when it collects taxes for those who do not want to pay them, to forward the Dharma and rid the world of greed? Hummm.

Malcolm wrote:

The answer to your question is that in Buddhist texts it is made very clear that not paying taxes is theft. That should answer your question about citizen obligations according to Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Astus, what Huineng says is nothing special. The realization of a first stage bodhisattva is the same wisdom a Buddha fully realizes. The difference between an ārya bodhisattva and buddha is whether or not that realization is sustained 24/7/365. Bodhisattvas have equipoise and post-equipoise phases, where they may still act out afflictively. Buddhas are only in equipoise.

What accounts for this is that veil of twin obscurations a bodhisattva must burn away with diligent practice, and of course, in every lifetime, bodhisattvas on the impure stages regress completely to the level of common persons, and need to begin again, albeit, advancing more rapidly. It is only when they reach the eighth bhumi that this regression ceases and they attain power over birth.

Ignorance sustains them and prajñā eliminates them, but it is not the case that prajñā can eliminate all the traces sustained by ignorance in a single moment. This is why there are nine grades of affliction — from course-course to subtle-subtle— that need to be removed gradually, after one has realized emptiness on the path of seeing.

Astus said:

That is, in the role of wisdom eliminating ignorance there is no disagreement.

"You must realize that there is fundamentally no distinction between the buddha natures of the foolish and the wise—it is only because of delusion and enlightenment that [you think they are] different and that there are foolish and wise."

(Platform Sutra, ch 2, BDK Edition, p 28)

So this is where we get really into the Zen part then, i.e. sudden enlightenment. Because Huineng also says (p 30):

"To be enlightened to this Dharma is the Dharma of prajñā, to cultivate this practice is the practice of prajñā. To not cultivate this is to be an ordinary [unenlightened] person. To cultivate this in a single moment of thought is to be equivalent to the Buddha in one's own body."

And (p 31): "To use wisdom to contemplate all the dharmas without grasping or rejecting is to see the nature and accomplish the enlightenment of buddhahood."

Also (p 33): "If you recognize the self-nature, with a single [experience of] enlightenment you will attain the stage of buddhahood."

And a clear description of what this Dharma is (p 33-34):

"in wisdom's contemplation both interior and exterior are clearly penetrated, and one recognizes one's own fundamental mind. If you recognize your fundamental mind, this is the fundamental emancipation. And if you attain emancipation, this is the samādhi of prajñā, this is nonthought. What is nonthought? If in seeing all the dharmas, the mind is not defiled or attached, this is nonthought. [The mind's] functioning pervades all locations, yet it is not attached to all the locations. Just purify the fundamental mind, causing the six consciousnesses to emerge from the six [sensory] gates, [causing one to be] without defilement or heterogeneity within the six types of sensory data (literally, the "six dusts"), autonomous in the coming and going [of mental phenomena], one's penetrating function without stagnation. ... to be enlightened to the Dharma of nonthought is for the myriad dharmas to be completely penetrated. To be enlightened to the Dharma of nonthought is to see the realms of [all] the buddhas. To be enlightened to the Dharma of nonthought is to arrive at the stage of buddhahood."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 12:11 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Queequeg said:

I spent a summer in Vermont. Loved it. Loved Burlington. Being from the Northeast, you grow up knowing of that real Yankee democracy up in New England.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, as a Yankee [born in NY state, but raised in MA], I feel you.

For libertarian municipalism, see:

Murray Bookchin. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Murray_Bookchin

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Libertarian_municipalism

Bookchin's final essay:

<http://social-ecology.org/wp/2002/09/harbinger-vol-3-no-1-the-communalist-project/>

Queequeg said:

"What these observations add up to is that Marxists, revolutionary syndicalists, and authentic anarchists all have a fallacious understanding of politics, which should be

conceived as the civic arena and the institutions by which people democratically and directly manage their community affairs. Indeed the Left has repeatedly mistaken statecraft for politics by its persistent failure to understand that the two are not only radically different but exist in radical tension—in fact, opposition—to each other.⁶ As I have written elsewhere, historically politics did not emerge from the state—an apparatus whose professional machinery is designed to dominate and facilitate the exploitation of the citizenry in the interests of a privileged class. Rather, politics, almost by definition, is the active engagement of free citizens in the handling their municipal affairs and in their defense of its freedom. One can almost say that politics is the “embodiment” of what the French revolutionaries of the 1790s called *civicisme*. Quite properly, in fact, the word politics itself contains the Greek word for “city” or polis, and its use in classical Athens, together with democracy, connoted the direct governing of the city by its citizens. Centuries of civic degradation, marked particularly by the formation of classes, were necessary to produce the state and its corrosive absorption of the political realm.”

Malcolm wrote:

And:

It is my contention that Communalism is the overarching political category most suitable to encompass the fully thought out and systematic views of social ecology, including libertarian municipalism and dialectical naturalism.⁸ As an ideology, Communalism draws on the best of the older Left ideologies—Marxism and anarchism, more properly the libertarian socialist tradition—while offering a wider and more relevant scope for our time. From Marxism, it draws the basic project of formulating a rationally systematic and coherent socialism that integrates philosophy, history, economics, and politics. Avowedly dialectical, it attempts to infuse theory with practice. From anarchism, it draws its commitment to antistatism and confederalism, as well as its recognition that hierarchy is a basic problem that can be overcome only by a libertarian socialist society.⁹

He didn't like Sanders much, because Bernie is not an ideologue and never hewed to an ideological discourse. He was always an organizer, rather than a theoretician.

Bookchin's people definitely were a pain in Bernie's ass, but this is a good thing. They are quite as responsible for Burlington's flowering as Sanders, in reality. If it was not for fate, I would be living in VT right now. As it stands, I am in Western MA, in the hilltowns.

While Bernie would never admit it, I think, I believe that his views tend towards Bookchin's Communalism more than they don't.

berniesanders.com.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 17th, 2016 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Queequeg said:

I spent a summer in Vermont. Loved it. Loved Burlington. Being from the Northeast, you grow up knowing of that real Yankee democracy up in New England.

Well, as a Yankee [born in NY state, but raised in MA], I feel you.

I will need to look into this Municipal Libertarianism.

Murray Bookchin. He didn't like Sanders much, because Bernie is not an ideologue and never hewed to an ideological discourse. He was always an organizer, rather than a theoretician. Bookchin's people definitely were a pain in Bernie's ass, but this is a good thing. They are quite as responsible for Burlington's flowering as Sanders, in reality. If it was not for fate, I would be living in VT right now. As it stands, I am in Western MA, in the hilltowns.

That's Trump's platform, too. We need a little more clarification.

Malcolm wrote:

berniesanders.com.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 16th, 2016 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As long as one has not eradicated latent afflictions [anusayas], one continues to take rebirth in samsara, even after realizing emptiness

Astus said:

What maintains and what eradicates latent afflictions?

Malcolm wrote:

Ignorance sustains them and prajñā eliminates them, but it is not the case that prajñā can eliminate all the traces sustained by ignorance in a single moment. This is why there are nine grades of affliction — from course-course to subtle-subtle — that need to be removed gradually, after one has realized emptiness on the path of seeing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 16th, 2016 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Astus said:

When there is nothing seen to be attached to, how can affliction arise?

Malcolm wrote:

As long as one has not eradicated latent afflictions, one continues to take rebirth in samsara, even after realizing emptiness, Astus. Hence the distinction between the

impure and pure bhumis.

jundo cohen said:

It strikes me that much of this discussion is starting to have little connection to Zen doctrines, although in the Zen section of the Forum.

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:

Really, you don't have a concept afflictions, rebirth, and freedom from affliction in Zen? I distinctly recall Dogen taking about all these issues and in very conventional terms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 16th, 2016 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

That is not liberation, Astus, that is a realization. But liberation and realization are not the same thing, though the two are often confused. Liberation is freedom from affliction that causes rebirth in samsara. If one does not understand this, one has understood nothing of the Dharma.

Astus said:

When there is nothing seen to be attached to, how can affliction arise?

Malcolm wrote:

As long as one has not eradicated latent afflictions [anusayas], one continues to take rebirth in samsara, even after realizing emptiness, Astus. Hence the distinction between the impure and pure bhumis, or for that matter, stream entrants, etc.

It seems that you believe that once you have realized emptiness, your job is done. This is an error.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 16th, 2016 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Astus said:

There are the five aggregates and six sensory areas. The only difference between buddhas and beings is whether there is attachment to them or not.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the difference between buddhas and sentient beings is the presence or absence of traces. In other words, the difference is more subtle than you admit. It is quite possible for someone to be free of grasping, but not to be free of latent afflictions [for example,

someone on the path of application's level of patience.] This is why samatha does not produce liberation. It merely suppresses the afflictions.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 16th, 2016 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

PS - Thank you to Indrajala for, as always, some fine writing and commentary on the historical development of the Vinaya, Priesthood and Sangha, and how these things which seem solid, unbending and established all through the millenia were anything but.

Malcolm wrote:

They were pretty solid, Jundo. Jeff is writing about practices that were on the margins, outliers, as it were.

The fact that some monasteries in Gandhara were making wine has to do with Bactrian culture. Indians themselves were never known to be particularly adept at wine making, and imported most of it from Greek traders.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 16th, 2016 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Astus said:

What is that meaning? To attain liberation. Just as I have acknowledged there. What does liberation mean? To fully realise that there is nothing in samsara that is worth clinging to.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not liberation, Astus, that is a realization. But liberation and realization are not the same thing, though the two are often confused.

Liberation is freedom from affliction that causes rebirth in samsara. If one does not understand this, one has understood nothing of the Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 16th, 2016 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Queequeg said:

Grassroots means local politics...

What does Bernie brand local policy look like?

What does it mean for municipal employee hiring? School board? Public works? Zoning and land use?

I'm serious. What does Bernie's vision look like at a local level? Burlington?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure. Look at his tenure as mayor and everything he did for that city from bringing high-paying manufacturing jobs, to revitalizing the waterfront, to creating a housing trust that is enormously successful at providing excellent housing at affordable prices.

These are the kind of programs you can bet that Sanders will prioritize. BTW, you might want to look into Municipal Libertarianism. People might laugh, but in fact Vermont has one of the more enlightened political cultures in the United States. Oregon and Vt, are like mirror images of each other, in many ways.

Queequeg said:

What if we don't have UVM and Nectars? What if we're just a sort of crunchy metro bedroom community?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, than you have to wake people up out of their stepford, ambien/prozac/zoloft/wellbutrin induced hazes.

Queequeg said:

What if we're a rural manufacturing town?

Malcolm wrote:

Hence Sanders arguments about trade agreements...

Queequeg said:

Need a policy declaration to coalesce around.

Malcolm wrote:

"Enough is enough."

-- Bernie Sanders

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 16th, 2016 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Marriage in Buddhist Cultures

Content:

sillyrabbit said:

I'd imagine that marriage was the realm of local beliefs/practices and death was the realm of Buddhism. But, those are just my imaginings...

Malcolm wrote:

"Marriage", as a declaration of contractual obligation, is mostly an aristocratic institution, historically speaking.

What we call "marriage" now has been for most of the past three millenia or more, a form of chattel bondage for women in Western Civilization.

And forms of "marriage" are even less clear outside of the Greco-Roman sphere (to which Islam also belongs). In Tibetan for example, marriage has been mostly based on shacking up. The term for "wife" is "chung ma," "little lady." And it even so, it was really only the bdag chens, the great lords, for whom weddings were really performed. For villagers, at most it might involve inviting two families together, some recitations, smoke offerings, some dancing, and drinking.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 16th, 2016 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Madman's Middle Way: Reflections on Reality of the Tibetan Monk Gendun Chopel (Buddhism and Modernity Series)

This is the most important book on Madhyamaka written in the 20th century.

dzogchungpa said:

BTW, there's another translation of this text available, published by Shang Shung:

<https://www.amazon.com/Ornament-Thought-Nagarjuna-Clarifying-Madhyamaka/dp/B005KJUHQI>

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, but Lopez's is better.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 16th, 2016 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Matt J said:

Following this thread, I'm lead to wonder whether there's much difference between Gelug "inherent existence" and non-Gelug "existence"; and "mere existence" as opposed to "mere appearance." Tsongkhapafan is even using the standard dream example to describe mere existence much the same way I've seen Nyingma/Kagyus describe appearances.

Bakmoon said:

I'm of the same mind. The way I see it, Je Tsongkhapa's teaching of 'mere existence' is

just a technical formulation for illusory and mere appearance, so the whole issue is largely one of semantics.

Not to say that all the differences are purely semantic, but I think that a lot of the criticism of Gelug in regards to conventional existence is marked by both sides just talking past one another because they use words differently.

Malcolm wrote:

The real issue with Gelug view is their formulation of the ultimate solely as absence of inherent existence. This in fact does not go beyond the cessation of a śrāvaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 16th, 2016 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

But we are not talking about revising the Vinaya here, we are talking about changing the meaning of the term celibacy. It is a little different. One could just recognise the FACT that they are not celibate and just get on with life, instead of trying to bullshit people.

Indrajala said:

Japanese monks these days admit most members of their various orders are married and have children.

I personally don't feel that devalues their status as teachers and practitioners.

Malcolm wrote:

No one ever said it did.

Indrajala said:

It is just different from the vinaya-based systems. That difference, I feel, shouldn't mean one gets a higher status in the order or precedence over the other. That's just my opinion, but I'm fairly ecumenical. If I were Christian I'd hope I could invite a married Protestant minister and Catholic priest to sit together at the same table as equals. The same principle applies to the Buddhist context.

Malcolm wrote:

But that is not how it is. The bhikṣu, etc., Sangha is entitled to some privilege because they represent the dispensation of Śākyamuni, the buddha of this time. Other Buddhas did not have a bhikṣu Sangha.

If you ordain tomorrow, even though you are first stage bodhisattva, you will still be seated in the order in which you were ordained. That is how it has always been. It's a good thing. Some traditions are worth preserving.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 15th, 2016 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Marriage in Buddhist Cultures

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Lots of death rites in Dharma, none for marriage, that ought to tell you something about marriage in Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 15th, 2016 at 5:43 PM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

Indrajala said:

In short, married clergy are under no obligation to recognize the supposed religious authority of the vinaya sangha.

Malcolm wrote:

It is good that you acknowledge there is a difference.

Indrajala said:

Japanese monks are free to do as they wish and if other Buddhists don't like it then no sense trying to bully and belittle them into feeling otherwise. Japanese Buddhism has survived for several centuries without any vinaya tradition.

Malcolm wrote:

In matters of religion everyone is also free to do as they wish. However, it is hardly inappropriate to observe that Japanese Buddhist monastic practices simply are not normative, when compared with how things are run in the Mulasarvastivada, Dharmaguptaka, and Theravada Sanghas.

Further, there has been no twentieth century Vinaya revivalism in the Mulasarvastivada Sangha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 15th, 2016 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Jeff H said:

I do agree that Gendun Chopel might provided a healthy balance. Georges Dreyfus speaks of him in The Sound of Two Hands Clapping and I found references online, but I

don't see a book with the word Madhyamaka in the title. Do you have a specific title for me to check out?

Malcolm wrote:

The Madman's Middle Way: Reflections on Reality of the Tibetan Monk Gendun Chopel (Buddhism and Modernity Series)

This is the most important book on Madhyamaka written in the 20th century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 15th, 2016 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Jeff H said:

I certainly respect that you are so qualified, but for the time being my confidence has to lie primarily with what I am trying to understand my teachers are saying from a pro-Tsongkhapa perspective. I consider this to be my starting place and I need to have a firmer grasp on it before trying to adopt an alternative view, which I also only partially understand.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a mistake, and is not the way Tsongkhapa developed his own view.

Rather than becoming expert in someone's presentation dogmatically, you need, as the Buddha and Aryadeva state, to subject it to the same kind of analysis a goldsmith applies to gold.

Now then, Gelugpas are excellent scholars, and they love to debate. But their blindspot is revering Tsongkhapa so much that they deliberately ignore the many places where he directly contradicts Nāgārjuna, etc.

The goal of a someone studying Madhyamaka should be to understand Nāgārjuna's intention, not Tsongkhapa's. You should get Gendun Chopel's book on Madhyamaka as a healthy balance to your studies of Tsongkhapa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 15th, 2016 at 2:42 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

boda said:

If someone actually were beyond front or back, or it wasn't important to them, they'd be

perfectly content to sit in the back.

Malcolm wrote:

The unspoken subtext to the whole conversation.

Here's too the back of the bus, where I always sat, because the bumps were bigger, and the companionship more entertaining!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 15th, 2016 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Gassho, J

PS - Lovely poem by the way.

Malcolm wrote:

Its from the book you posted. I read really fast.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 15th, 2016 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

... Moreover, through maintenance of different sets of precepts, with different expectations, the sect seeks to manage and systematize the divide between lay and [ordained]. The maintenance of different precepts by priests and laity is one way in which priests are distinguished from worldly individuals.

<http://www.elibrary.ibc.ac.th/files/private/Japanese%20Temple%20Buddhism%20Worldliness%20in%20a%20Religion%20of%20Renunciation.pdf>

Malcolm wrote:

Pretty grim book.

I am a priest.

Wearing my robes, my prayer beads in my left hand, I ride my bicycle.

I go from house to parishioner's house and chant sutra.

I am a priest.

I have a wife, I have a child.

I drink sake, I eat meat.

I eat fish, I lie.

And, still, I am a priest.

A dirty, too dirty, priest.

When I call upon parishioners and accept their donations,

is this not theft?

Oh, the five precepts that Shakyamuni kept,
I have broken them all.

But, yet, I am a bodhisattva.

I travel the path of the bodhisattva.

I have faith in the Dharma, I sit in the palm of the Law.

I live in the Dharma, I live amongst the people.

Within endless life, I practice the way.

Hand in hand with other practitioners, I proceed down
this peaceful path, this path without equal
the path of Truth, the bodhisattva path.

I am filthy, and I have broken all of the five precepts but,
but, because of the Dharma, all will become Buddhas.

That path, that bodhisattva path.

I am standing on that path.

—Temple priest, c. 1980

While I can sympathize with the above, the situation described in the book you presented us with precisely outlines why it is important to make a distinction between Mahāyāna ordinands and Hinayāna ordinands, as well as Mahāyāna vows and Hinayāna vows (In fact, Vajrayāna vows are completely outside the scope of this discussion, and the attempt to involve Vajrayāna in this discussion is disingenuous).

The fact is that in terms of the three kinds of vows, bhikṣu and bhikṣuni, śrāmanera and śrāmanerika and upāsaka and upāsika, the first are the foremost. The bodhisattva vows are necessarily based on any of these three, but if one does not have bhikṣu or śrāmanera vows (or bhikṣuni and śrāmanerika vows), one may be a fantastic Mahāyāna practitioner, but one will never be included in the ordained (pravrajyā, lit. homeless) sangha since one will not meet the basic requirements of renunciation required for being a member of the ordained sangha, no matter how fancy one's robes are, whether one shaves one's head or not, or recites sūtras for "lay" people.

So, as I said above, you're stuck in the back of the bus with us regular unordained folks, Jundo. Better get used to our unwashed smell. We'll let you sit in front of us, but behind the five year old śrāmanera.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 15th, 2016 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

jundo said:

Let each person call themselves what they wish, so long as their actions are sincere and helpful.

DGA said:

This is an interesting thought experiment. What would happen if all Buddhist

practitioners did as you say here, and adopted in all sincerity and with the intention to be helpful the labels they find most suitable? Put differently: What if after spending some time reading the Shobogenzo and reflecting on its meaning and practicing zazen to the best of my ability I decide to call myself a Soto Zen master, and start ordaining my own disciples? I'm spreading the Dharma in this hypothetical situation, and that's good, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Based on Jundo's own statement, he would have absolutely no intrinsic or legal right to challenge your authority, authenticity or right to deem yourself a "Soto Zen master." But I am quite sure he would denounce you in no uncertain terms as a pretender.

I don't think anyone holds the trademark on the name "Soto Zen" in the US. The person who holds that trademark could conceivably bar anyone in the US from referring to themselves by that appellation.

BTW, Jundo, it is ironic that someone who uses this as a mission statement, "We intend to expand and develop our awareness of the ways we are conditioned to separate ourselves by socioeconomic class, nationality, race, age, creed, gender, sexual orientation, physical ability and other forms of identity," has been found to be so wrapped up in an identity. Conditioned much?

Thank goodness I have no aspirations to be anything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 15th, 2016 at 12:24 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Let each person call themselves what they wish, so long as their actions are sincere and helpful.

Malcolm wrote:

That did not fly very well in the third Century CE, which is why a third Buddhist council was called, and King Ashoka forced thousands of so called "monks" to "defrock."

The distinction that seems lost upon you is the distinction between Mahāyāna vows and Hinayāna vows. There are no Mahāyāna bhikṣu ordinations.

So you are going to have to sit in the back of the bus along with me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 14th, 2016 at 11:50 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Jeff H said:

The two truths are two isolates of one entity.

Malcolm wrote:

This is explicitly stated by Candrakīrti. All phenomena possess two natures, one relative; the other, ultimate.

Jeff H said:

From the ordinary perspective, that entity seems to have self-nature; from the ultimate perspective it seems not to exist.

Malcolm wrote:

Even Tsongkhapa admits that ordinary people are incapable of distinguishing inherent existence from existence. He therefore erects a third category called "mere existence" which is not to be analyzed.

Jeff H said:

Limiting ourselves to the conventional is eternalism; limiting ourselves to the ultimate is nihilism.

Malcolm wrote:

What Tsongkhapa explicitly says is that things do not "not exist" in the relative, and they do not exist in the ultimate. Because of this, because of asserting the reality of things is an ultimate nonexistence, the Gelugpas are often charged with having a subtle view of annihilationism, and thus deviating from the true intention of the Prasangika position outlined by Chandrakīrti and his followers, Jayananda and Patsab Nyima Dragpa.

Jeff H said:

We experience entities and they function regardless of the fact that in meditative equipoise they do not exist. Tsongkhapa took Nagarjuna's teaching that whatever is dependently arisen is empty and whatever is empty is dependently arisen to formulate a philosophy expressly unifying the two. But he didn't address any ontological assertion about whether or not there could be a "true" ontology.

Malcolm wrote:

Wrong, he asserts that the absence of inherent existence which is the emptiness that is the nonexistence of the true existence of things is reality. This is his ontological position. He asserts this as ultimate truth.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 14th, 2016 at 4:46 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

skittles said:

Pointing out that Ashkhenazi Jews are European is apt because Israel uses race in their nonsensical claims to land when in fact Palestinians are actual descendents of the historical Jews. There's nothing anti-semitic about pointing out the inconsistencies of a racist ideology like Zionism.

Genetically, many Ashkhenazis have no ethnic tie to the historical Jews. What religion they choose as individuals is something they determine and I haven't been talking about their religion other than that Zionism is not Judaism.

Malcolm wrote:

The fact is that Askhenazi Jews have DNA markers that place their origins in the Levant. Case closed.

rory said:

And when is Skittles, following his sincerely held beliefs, going to give up his house and return to his native land, which I assume to be somewhere in Europe?

gassho

Rory

Malcolm wrote:

I have no clue, I was just refuting his idea that Askhenazi Jews are not of Jewish lineal descent from the region of Israel, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 14th, 2016 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: Lama's that teach 100% retention

Content:

kirtu said:

following the practice of the layperson in the mode of Chandragomin is the other main sutric practice (unfortunately this has not entirely disappeared but practically no one hears anything about it).

Mother's Lap said:

The gomin lineage isn't dead? I know the anagarika is still available in Theravada.

kirtu said:

I was told that it still exists but perhaps the person was wrong. In the Drikung lineage there is still a bhramacharya (total abstinence for a layperson) vow transmission. A friend of mine holds these vows but he would not consider himself a gomin actually, but my reading is that he almost fits the definition (except he eats after noon and watches TV and sometimes sings and wears cologne and most importantly - not all of his time is

devoted to the Dharma [but much of it is]). So perhaps there is some confusion around the terminology.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, as Vasubandhu clarifies, the Gomin ordination never belonged to Sarvastivada lineage in general, and thus, it never really existed in Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 14th, 2016 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Keep your own views to yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not obligated to do so, and you never do.

jundo cohen said:

If you are not obligated to do so, than I am not obligated to cease from calling you a religious bigot and holier than thou hypocrite at every opportunity in response.

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course, Jundo, and through your continued insults, you will reveal yourself to be something like the Trump of Zen, embarrassing yourself at every turn, yet too vain to see it. Please continue, I won't reply in kind since I have no need to issue petty and personal insults.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 14th, 2016 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Keep your own views to yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

I am not obligated to do so, and you never do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 14th, 2016 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

I am merely pointing out your blatant hypocrisy. You defend your own sect's seemingly wild and unique beliefs as beyond challenge, orthodox and the True Word, but decry others. Shame on you.

Malcolm wrote:

Jundo, I have not discussed any of your beliefs, apart from the one in which you believe, and I maintain falsely, that your ordination is anything other than a Mahāyāna upāsaka ordination. I understand the context, and history, and so on for how Soto ordinations evolved as they did. I respect that. I just don't believe that apart from the five vows that all upāsakas maintain (theoretically), that your bodhisattva vows put you on the same level as a fully ordained bhikṣu in any of three surviving ordination lineages.

Some will argue, perhaps correctly, perhaps not, that someone with bodhisattvas vows who is lay person is superior to someone who holds only bhikṣu vows, and certainly in Mahāyāna, we maintain that the realization of a first stage bodhisattva, or even someone who has newly minted bodhisattva aspiration is far superior even to an arhat, but as I have exhaustively explained, in the wider community of Buddhadharma, where there are hundreds of thousands of fully ordained monks, the conceit that Japanese monastics of any stripe hold vows equivalent to a fully ordained bhikṣu will just be met with tolerant disagreement.

Finally, I do not believe you actually possess the necessary scholarship or realization to challenge even the views of lower tantra, let alone the pinnacle of all Buddhadharma, Atiyoga. But you may try, if you feel up to it. But first I think you need to learn something about it. Maybe you should start with Tendai Mikkyo or Shingon, and work your way up from there.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 14th, 2016 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

Caodemarte said:

Malcolm, I suggest you re-read the words of my question if you think you have in any way answered it.

Malcolm wrote:

I understand your question, and why you might find my answer unsatisfying. Nevertheless, the answer I gave is all the answer you are going to get.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 14th, 2016 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Religious bigotry posing as defense of the True Faith.

Malcolm wrote:

"Bigotry" means intolerance of others' opinions. I have expressed no intolerance of your views, merely a reasoned disagreement with them.

Your open slander of Vajrayāna on the other hand, is precisely the kind of bigotry you are complaining about.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 14th, 2016 at 1:40 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

Caodemarte said:

Again, not a response to my relatively simple question. If you do not want to respond to it and wish to discuss something else, that's perfectly fine. It is very strange that you would quote it if you do not want to engage with it.

Malcolm wrote:

I have answered your question very precisely. There are only three valid monastic ordination lineages in Buddhism which have survived.

The rest are Mahāyāna ordinations, and that is how the Vinayadharas of all three lineages would see it. If you doubt me, go ask one of them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 14th, 2016 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

Caodemarte said:

That is not a response to my question (really two related questions), which is: "Do any Tibetan monk teachers claim the authority to define what a monk "really" is or is not for different sects, outside of their own? Or is this is just a Western lay convert claim?"

Malcolm wrote:

It is an issue of distinguishing the three sets of vows, Hinayāna, Mahāyāna and Mantrayāna.

As such, there are Mulasarvastivadin Vinayadharas, Dharmaguptaka Vinayadharas, and Theravadin Vinayadharas. These are the people who have the proper authority to ordain monks, i.e. śramaṇeras or bhikṣus

All other ordinations outside of these are Mahāyāna ordinations, and their recipients who have not received śramaṇera or bhikṣu ordinations are upāsakas, lay people.

Unfortunately, most Westerners who decide to follow Zen are completely ignorant of these things, and upon shaving their heads, wrongly imagine that they are "bhikṣus", beggars, even though they marry, drink, and raise families, and as is often the case among the better off, drive very fancy cars, go to expensive restaurants, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 14th, 2016 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Traditional Medicine

Content:

karmadrakpayeshe said:

well sounds like you do, thanks for you contribution. No I have not REALLY studied Tibetan medicine. As to whether or not tibetan herbs are more effective, well, I feel I have tried both traditions equally for my own health, and have better experience with ayurvedic herbs in the health problems I've dealt with.

But to discuss the herb variety matter; was it not a lot easier to get things from Tibet in India than the other way around? I am just asserting this might have influenced the way the traditions evolved. Logically if the poorer Tibetans could not get something from india, was too expensive, or caravans stopped coming, but Indians still had the incredible riches to get things from Tibet, wouldn't Tibetans have stuck with things they knew they could get, even when something they might not be able to might be better? Couldn't that have effected the tradition that continues on to this day?

Malcolm wrote:

In general, the kinds of medicines imported into Tibet from India were things that could bear portage, thus, things like triphala, etc., were imported and form an important part of Tibetan materia medica. But herbs proper could not survive the journey, and in any case, were not necessary, since the Tibetan plateau itself is astonishingly rich in wild flora. Rhodiola, for example, comes from the high Himalayas and so forth. Also the environment is purer.

Tibetan medicine manufactured in India is often of inferior quality to that which is

manufactured in Tibet. I only stock herbs imported directly from Tibet.

And the Tibetans were not poorer by any means. Tibetans unloaded tons of gold on the Indians for the Dharma. Tibet mainly exported salt, however.

That said, I practice a mix of Tibetan Medicine and Ayurveda, matching the treatment with the patient. But because of their superior effect and purity, I tend to favor Tibetan herbs sourced from Tibet over Ayurvedic herbs sourced from India.

karmadrakpayeshe said:

I wonder why I had so little luck with Tibetan medicine. I went to doctors while living in Darjeeling(the institute of Tibetan medicine) and also in Boudhanath Kathmandu(shechen clinic). Maybe their herbs were from India I'm sure those are cheaper. Maybe I didn't take them regularly Enough and then I could have just not noticed they were helping me

Malcolm wrote:

It is also possible that you were not properly cared for. The wrong herbs wont get to the point of the disease. Also they tend to give westerners smaller doses since they think we are weaker.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 14th, 2016 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

Caodemarte said:

Do any Tibetan monk teachers claim the authority to define what a monk "really" is or is not for different sects, outside of their own? Or is this is just a Western lay convert claim?

Malcolm wrote:

It is defined in the Vinaya. Only Japanese Buddhism is outside the norm we find in Tibetan Buddhism, Theravada and Chinese Buddhism for defining who or what is a "monk" (śramaṇera, bhikṣu). I really do not understand what is complicated about this.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 11:38 PM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Samantabhadra does not really have a penis at all, nor does Samantabhadri have a vagina. These are just representations for the limited human mind. If we were elephants,

Samantabhadra/Samantabhadri would be a blue elephant couple.

jundo cohen said:

I was going to write something here as a reasoned retort ...

... but after reading such words, I truly feel that there is no need.

Gassho, J

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because in fact, while the Dharmakāya is beyond representation, it is represented as such through the symbol of the Adibuddha couple in union symbolizing the union of bliss and emptiness. They are naked, of course, because they are completely free of all fabrication.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

That's why I am now going to (re)pose a question to shake the Vajrayani's out there:

If a Bhikku/Bhikkuni was to engage in Kamra Mudra practice with a "real" partner, would this count as a Parajika offence?

Malcolm wrote:

In general, yes, but not always. It depends on the realization of the practitioners (both of them).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

One minute, you are talking about how things work "functionally" in the real world, the next you are telling me how Samantabhadra's penis has no front or back!

Malcolm wrote:

Samantabhadra does not really have a penis at all, nor does Samantabhadri have a vagina. These are just representations for the limited human mind. If we were elephants, Samantabhadra/Samantabhadri would be a blue elephant couple.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Jeff H said:

... and that "can" in this one was not?

Malcolm wrote:

Relatively speaking, we can contrast the conditioned and the unconditioned, but not ultimately. Why? Because the very definition of the conditioned, born, become, made, etc., defines for us its opposite, unconditioned, unborn, unmade, etc., and renders the latter a mere relative construct that cannot be found according to an ultimate analysis.

Jeff H said:

In other words, I think you are saying that the unconditioned is the implied emptiness of the conditioned, and thus it (emptiness) is affirmed by ultimate analysis. (But if it is a relative construct, then it can't be found by ultimate analysis.)

Malcolm wrote:

Typo, should read:

However, all phenomena, whether conditioned or [unconditioned, cannot bear ultimate analysis, including nirvana (cessation due to analysis).

...

... and that "can" in this one was not? Relatively speaking, we can contrast the conditioned and the unconditioned, but not ultimately. Why? Because the very definition of the conditioned, born, become, made, etc., defines for us its opposite, unconditioned, unborn, unmade, etc., and renders the latter a mere relative construct that cannot be found according to an ultimate analysis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Hard to be a historical outlier since there is no reason to believe in time, nor limit the universe to vocabulary definitions.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, there is no reason to believe in time, or limit the universe to vocabulary

definitions, nevertheless we do live in time, and function according to how things are defined functionally, according to causes and effects.

jundo cohen said:

(and I thought you are the guy who always lectures me when I say that the Sutras and such were probably not the words of the "historical" Buddha because, in your view, such are beyond all ordinary channels and concerns of time and what is reasonable and dictionary defined).

Malcolm wrote:

"Sutras" do not reside in the words written down on paper. Those are human documents, subject to change and transformation, editing and so no. Sūtras come from the dharmakāya, utter through the mouth of this and that nirmanakāya, to which there is no limitation. The words written down are just a reflection of that. The ones that help a person enter that knowledge of the dharmakāya are definitive, the rest are provisional, useful conventionally, but not ultimately. Our conversation about this is strictly conventional.

jundo cohen said:

Speaking of which, here is Samantabhadra getting it on. Is he a lay person now, or should we expel him from the Sangha?

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:

This is not the real Samantabhadra. This is representation of the dharmakāya, showing that buddhahood is the union of bliss and emptiness. You can't expel the dharmakāya from the Sangha, since the all Sanghas come from the dharmakāya.

The Mind Mirror of Samantabhadra opens:

That permeating kāya of pristine consciousness, the ultimate garbha, is present without restrictions, facing everywhere without front or back. He teaches sentient beings the meaning of not coming or going.

Nice try, but missing the point.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Herbie said:

Well the characteristic of Tsongkhapa's approach is - in contrast to other approaches - that it deals with "inherent existence" as the opposite of emptiness.

Yes, and this is well recognized.

His rational for this is that not identifying the existence to be negated as inherent existence entails "over-negating" common objects as non-existent when actually they do exist depending on imputation, i.e. exist dependently but not inherently.

Malcolm wrote:

Inherent existence is also an imputation. Therefore, what is the difference between the two imputations, existence and inherent existence?

It is for this reason that Nāgārjuna notes that there is no existence not included in inherent existence (svabhāva) and dependent existence (parabhāva). He then continues on to say that whoever has a view of inherent existence, dependent existence, existence, or nonexistence has not understood the meaning of the Buddha's teachings.

The reason one negates existence is not to assert nonexistence. One negates existence in order to negate the nonexistence of an existent. This is all carefully argued in chapter 15 of the MMK. In fact, common people do not think cups and persons exist inherently, since they observe them to also cease to exist. This is why Nāgārjuna points out that "nonexistence" is the transformation of something that once was and now is not, according to common parlance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Do you want to have a serious discussion or are you happy trying to derail the thread again?

jundo cohen said:

I am not sure how I have "derailed" the thread.

Malcolm wrote:

You haven't, you just have obscurantist tendencies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Everyone in Buddhism is an outlier to someone.

Malcolm wrote:

The issue is ordination. In this respect, as much as you try to obfuscate the issue, one cannot deny that Japanese Buddhism represents a historical outlier when it comes to the issue of so called "monastic ordinations."

The base line of the higher Hinayāna pratimokṣa in all Buddhist traditions, apart from the Japanese Buddhism, is the śramaṇera (novice ordination) and the bench mark is the bhikṣu ordination. Everyone else is a lay person.

For example, Vimalakīrti was very highly realized, much more realized than Śāriputra, Mahākāśyapa, etc. But he was always and will ever remain the gold standard for the Mahāyāna lay person. But he was not a monk, he was a simple upāsaka. Like me, and like you.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 8:34 PM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

But there is no 'norm'!

Malcolm wrote:

There is a norm. Japanese Buddhism just happens to be an outlier for the historical reasons I have mentioned. That has nothing to do with whether or not Japanese Buddhist clergy function effectively for their Sanghas or are spiritual people, etc. But in the context of the wider Buddhist world, as much as Jundo and others may wish to dispute this, they are a lay (upāsaka) clergy.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 8:29 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Traditional Medicine

Content:

karmadrakpayeshe said:

well sounds like you do, thanks for your contribution. No I have not REALLY studied Tibetan medicine. As to whether or not Tibetan herbs are more effective, well, I feel I have tried both traditions equally for my own health, and have better experience with ayurvedic herbs in the health problems I've dealt with.

But to discuss the herb variety matter; was it not a lot easier to get things from Tibet in India than the other way around? I am just asserting this might have influenced the way

the traditions evolved. Logically if the poorer Tibetans could not get something from India, was too expensive, or caravans stopped coming, but Indians still had the incredible riches to get things from Tibet, wouldn't Tibetans have stuck with things they knew they could get, even when something they might not be able to get might be better? Couldn't that have effected the tradition that continues on to this day?

Malcolm wrote:

In general, the kinds of medicines imported into Tibet from India were things that could bear portage, thus, things like triphala, etc., were imported and form an important part of Tibetan materia medica. But herbs proper could not survive the journey, and in any case, were not necessary, since the Tibetan plateau itself is astonishingly rich in wild flora. Rhodiola, for example, comes from the high Himalayas and so forth. Also the environment is purer.

Tibetan medicine manufactured in India is often of inferior quality to that which is manufactured in Tibet. I only stock herbs imported directly from Tibet.

And the Tibetans were not poorer by any means. Tibetans unloaded tons of gold on the Indians for the Dharma. Tibet mainly exported salt, however.

That said, I practice a mix of Tibetan Medicine and Ayurveda, matching the treatment with the patient. But because of their superior effect and purity, I tend to favor Tibetan herbs sourced from Tibet over Ayurvedic herbs sourced from India.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 12:04 PM

Title: Re: Tibetan Traditional Medicine

Content:

karmadrakpayeshe said:

Consider how limited varieties of herbs were in Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

You really have no idea what you are talking about.

karmadrakpayeshe said:

Edit: you know what I am not going to argue with you about the merits of the two and which are greater. Let's just leave it at that really I am just recommending ayurveda to this person because of the readily available English literature on it. It is so ridiculously more accessible to anyone not Tibetan than Tibetan medicine I'm not sure how you could not support this recommendation. And did not Tibetan medicine take so much from ayurveda? Chinese also, but for the sake of this person, that is while probably more accessible to a westerner than Tibetan, not as accessible as ayurveda for study.

Malcolm wrote:

I was responding to your assertion about the "limited" varieties of Tibetan herbs. In

reality, Tibetan herbs are plentiful, numerous, and much more effective than Ayurvedic herbs (it has to do with the altitude as well as the variety). Of course, tree medicines like haritaki, bibitaki, amalaki do not grow in Tibet, as well as things like nutmeg, etc., so they are imported.

But Tibetan herbal medicines, as well as shrubs, and trees that do not grow in India are extremely effective and plentiful. If you had actually studied Tibetan Medicine, you would know this. Now, for your information, I am a Doctor of Tibetan Medicine (Shang Shung 2009), and I am trained fully in Pañcakarma (by a doctor with a PhD in Pañcakarma in lives in South India) and other modalities, as well as Ayurvedic Herbalism as well. So I really do know what I am talking about.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 11:47 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Traditional Medicine

Content:

karmadrakpayeshe said:

Consider how limited varieties of herbs were in Tibet.

Malcolm wrote:

You really have no idea what you are talking about.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 11:33 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

skittles said:

Pointing out that Ashkhenazi Jews are European is apt because Israel uses race in their nonsensical claims to land when in fact Palestinians are actual descendents of the historical Jews. There's nothing anti-semitic about pointing out the inconsistencies of a racist ideology like Zionism.

Genetically, many Ashkhenazis have no ethnic tie to the historical Jews. What religion they choose as individuals is something they determine and I haven't been talking about their religion other than that Zionism is not Judaism.

Malcolm wrote:

The fact is that Askhenazi Jews have DNA markers that place their origins in the Levant. Case closed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 11:30 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you define "real" as "the ability to withstand ultimate analysis," then yes, nothing is real since nothing can bear ultimate analysis.

Wayfarer said:

Well, thanks, that's helpful. But on what basis is 'the ultimate analysis' made? If it's no basis, then how does it provide a foundation for analysis?

Malcolm wrote:

An ultimate analysis means analyzing a given thing such as a rock, or even nirvana, for any ultimate existence.

Wayfarer said:

I would have thought that 'conventionally existent' was a relative term - things are 'conventionally existent' in contrast to what is real. And furthermore that this is the basis of the two truths - that conventional truth, *saṃvṛiti-satya*, is contrasted with ultimate truth, *Paramārtha-satya*. Is that not the case?

Malcolm wrote:

Satyas are objects of cognitions. For example, Candrakīrti defines an ultimate truth as the object of an undeluded cognition. A relative truth is an object of a deluded cognition. The emptiness of a rock, for example, or nirvana, is an object of a undeluded cognition, hence it is ultimate. The cognition of a rock, or nirvana, are the object of a relative cognition.

However, all phenomena, whether conditioned or unconditioned, cannot bear ultimate analysis, including nirvana (cessation due to analysis).

So this counts Nirvāṇa as a phenomena?

Yes.

Dharmas (phenomena) are of two kinds: conditioned and unconditioned.

I would be interested in your interpretation of the sutta I referred to above, from UD8.3

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.

So is it the case that there is not 'an unborn'? I had always been inclined to read this verse literally. Am I mistaken in that regard?

[/quote]

Relatively speaking, we can contrast the conditioned and the unconditioned, but not

ultimately. Why? Because the very definition of the conditioned, born, become, made, etc., defines for us its opposite, unconditioned, unborn, unmade, etc., and renders the latter a mere relative construct that can be found according to an ultimate analysis.

It is for this reason that Nāgārjuna declared, following the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra, that not the slightest distinction can be made between samsara and nirvana since they are both relative constructs and cannot bear ultimate analysis in anyway.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 9:27 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Wayfarer said:

And the quote you provide says all phenomena are illusory displays of mind. Where in this thread have I said anything contrary to that? I am contrasting 'phenomena' with 'the unconditioned', subject to the caveat that, strictly speaking, 'the unconditioned' is not something that can be spoken of.

Malcolm wrote:

This is your basic error, Dharmas (phenomena) are of two kinds: conditioned and unconditioned.

There are classically three kinds of unconditioned dharmas: space and the two kinds of cessations.

Space is absence of obstruction.

The two kinds of cessation are analytical cessation and simple cessation.

Analytical cessation is nirvana.

Simple cessation is the absence of a cause of arising.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 9:24 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

skittles said:

lol. Can I interpret that as an endorsement?

Maybe I should just keep quiet since Bernie Sanders is a better candidate than Hillary?

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that congressman have the ability to attach rider amendments. Such amendments will not halt the passage of a major bill. In congress, you make compromises. In order to pass legislation you support, you often are forced to vote for legislation you do not support. It is just the way of things, that is the point. A congressman who refuses to compromise in this fashion will swiftly lose their seat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 9:20 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Wayfarer said:

The unconditioned

Malcolm wrote:

Nāgārjuna wrote

Since arising, abiding and perishing cannot be established, the conditioned cannot be established.

Since the conditioned cannot be established, how can the unconditioned be established?

Wayfarer said:

If this is saying that 'nothing exists', then I'm interested in understanding how this view avoids nihilism, which is the view that nothing is real. Buddhism generally and Nāgārjuna in particular, is often described as being nihilistic - how is that refuted?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not saying that something does not exist, it is saying that those states that we ascribe to the conditioned, arising, abiding and perishing, do not stand up to ultimate analysis. Since they do not stand up to ultimate analysis, neither does the unconditioned (space and the two kinds of cessation).

In other words, conventional phenomena are fine as long as they are not subject to ultimate analysis (and this is something all Madhyamakas agree with). However, all phenomena, whether conditioned or unconditioned, cannot bear ultimate analysis, including nirvana (cessation due to analysis).

If you define "real" as "the ability to withstand ultimate analysis," then yes, nothing is real since nothing can bear ultimate analysis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 7:16 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

skittles said:
It doesn't sound smart to me to act like that.

Malcolm wrote:
run for congress.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 7:06 AM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
When it comes to Sanders' record, you cannot just assume that what he "voted for" is what he actually voted for.

skittles said:
Malcolm, what you wrote is incomprehensible to me. What are you talking about? He voted to adopt.

Malcolm wrote:
Yeah, because you don't understand how Sanders works. He is does not always "vote" for things he is "voting" for. For example, he did not want billions of dollars sent to China by the Export Import bank for the their nuclear industry. So he attached an amendment to a bill that WOULD HAVE PASSED ANYWAY.

For example, he voted for the 94 Crime bill because he wanted money allocated to the Violence Against Women's act, while objecting to the general tenor of the bill as a whole.

He is a very smart legislator. And if you are smart, you will vote for him too.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 6:49 AM
Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation
Content:
Lukeinaz said:
If the object to be negated actually doesn't exist at all is it something you can find?

Herbie said:
yes because inherent existence is the object projected/superimposed by a mental factor onto the object that then appears as if inherently existent.
Identification of the object of negation which is inherent existence presumes that it can be found as projection. But since it seems to inhere in the object it is projected onto it cannot be found as an isolated stand-alone object but only with the object onto which it is projected. Therefore only this alleged inherently existent object can be sought but of

course cannot be found because an inherent existent object does not exist anywhere. However although the object onto which inherent existence is projected cannot be found by a rational consciousness the perception of the mere object still is there. So the difference between the perceptual appearance of the object before non-findability experientially "happened" and after that event is what corresponds to "inherent existence".

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, but this notion of "inherent existence" is not a notion that common people have, which is why in general Madhyamakas, including Candrakīrti, are satisfied with negating existence, the coarse object of negation, and only discuss inherent existence, the subtle object of negation, as a fine point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 6:45 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He only agreed to vote for this bill provided it contained his amendment, AO11:

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple and straightforward. It would prohibit the Export-Import Bank from providing corporate welfare for the construction of nuclear power plants in China.

Mr. Chairman, I think the rationale for supporting this amendment is obvious. At a time when we have a \$7.7 trillion national debt and a record-breaking Federal deficit, it is not only absurd, but it is dangerous for the taxpayers of this country to be subsidizing the construction of nuclear power plants in China.

{time} 1915

Mr. Chairman, amazingly enough, the company involved here, Westinghouse Electric, which builds nuclear technology is owned by British National Fuels which itself is a company wholly owned by the British government. So we are dealing with the absurdity of American taxpayers who are in the midst of a record breaking deficit, subsidizing the British government, a nation which, to the best of my knowledge, is not made up of starving, desperate people in the developing world.

Mr. Chairman, there is no debate, but that when these four nuclear power plants will be built at a cost which involves an Export-Import loan of some \$5 billion, that when these nuclear power plants will be built, the Chinese will own the technology. And a question that every Member of this Congress should be asking is, is it really in the best interest of the United States of America to provide advanced nuclear technology to China. Furthermore, the Chinese company which is building these four nuclear power plants, the Chinese national nuclear company

has been tied to at least three instances of weapons proliferation involving Iran and Pakistan.

Mr. Chairman, I do not always agree with the National Taxpayers Union. But let me briefly summarize what they say in a letter that they sent to me today.

NTU has long advocated total elimination of taxpayer funding of the Export-Import Bank for the simple fact that American taxpayers should not be forced to subsidize the overseas operation of U.S. corporation or foreign governments. Considering the rapid pace of economic growth in China and its emergence as a strong force in the global business environment, it is particularly egregious to waste taxpayer dollars on such a project.

<https://www.congress.gov/amendment/109th-congress/house-amendment/381/text>

When it comes to Sanders' record, you cannot just assume that what he "voted for" is what he actually voted for.

Similarly, HR 5522 2007, is basically the same bill.

skittles said:

Muslims in MI aren't the measure of who is or isn't pro-Israel. The reality is that Bernie Sanders voted to send USA money and arms to Israel.

Malcolm wrote:

Really, what vote, when? Sources please.

skittles said:

HR 3057 - Foreign Operations FY 2006 Appropriations Bill for instance.
\$2.28 billion for Israel plus \$240 million for Israel

This particular present to Israel, a country that is smaller than New Jersey, happened during the 2006 Gaza-Israel conflict.

Take a look for yourself:

<https://votesmart.org/candidate/key-votes/27110/bernie-sanders/89/foreign-aid>

Bernie Sanders can say whatever he wants, he's still voting just as badly as the worst republicans on Israel.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 6:25 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Wayfarer said:
The unconditioned

Malcolm wrote:
Nāgārjuna wrote
Since arising, abiding and perishing cannot be established, the conditioned cannot be established.
Since the conditioned cannot be established, how can the unconditioned be established?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 6:11 AM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016
Content:

skittles said:
I wasn't aware of that. I don't understand what you're getting at Malcolm. Maybe that was directed towards Rory who thinks Muslims are irrationally hateful of Jews?

Malcolm wrote:
What I am getting at is that Sanders is not a pro-Israel hawk.

skittles said:
Muslims in MI aren't the measure of who is or isn't pro-Israel. The reality is that Bernie Sanders voted to send USA money and arms to Israel.

Malcolm wrote:
Really, what vote, when? Sources please.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 5:27 AM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016
Content:

skittles said:
I wasn't aware of that. I don't understand what you're getting at Malcolm. Maybe that was directed towards Rory who thinks Muslims are irrationally hateful of Jews?

Malcolm wrote:
What I am getting at is that Sanders is not a pro-Israel hawk.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 5:01 AM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016
Content:
rory said:

Skittles I'm sure you're right about Middle Eastern benevolence; I suggest you go visit Syria and wear a nice big Star of David pendant, I'm sure you'll get the reception you richly deserve.

Dundee said:

I used to be Muslim and I have nothing against Jews and never did.

skittles said:

Rory is a pro-Israel xenophobe that has no experience with actual Muslims.

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize that American Muslims in Dearborn, MI overwhelmingly supported Sanders in the primary there this week, right?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 4:17 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

a)Vinaya, especially Pratimoksha.

jundo cohen said:

Are you saying that we don't uphold the Vinaya? Good. You are entitled. You can say we don't, we say we do.

Malcolm wrote:

You uphold lay pratimokṣa, personal liberation vows, the same five that all Buddhist lay people maintain, theoretically. These are a subsection of Vinaya, but not an important subsection.

You also have bodhisattva vows. These have nothing to do with Vinaya, and everything to do with Bodhisattva training.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 4:14 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[Edited for the sake of focus and harmony.]

jundo said:

Good for those on the Continent, and more power to them. Good for how things were done for 2500 years. Stick to your own ways and judge your own ways for your own. Let

them arrange the chairs and the titles as they wish inside their own temples, keep their values out of ours. Don't engage in doctrinal bigotry by judging others, judge yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not doctrinal bigotry to observe that Japanese Buddhism as a whole has changed to the point where its clergy no longer meet the same normative standards for monasticism observed in the rest of the Buddhist world. Therefore, it is hard to swallow that idea that ordinands such as yourself follow the Hinayana precepts necessary to be considered observant of Vinaya. Of course, no one would ever say that you were not followers of the Bodhisattva vows. I have them too. But Mahāyāna vows and Hinayāna vows are different, and that is why Saicho elected to discard the Hinayāna ordination in Tendai, which is the ancestor of your Soto ordination. There just isn't a single bhikṣu ordination rite based on Mahāyāna sūtras at all.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 3:35 AM

Title: Re: What does "monk" mean? Who is a monk, and who is not?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Hello,

There are some problems with the premises of the questions asked. First, the terms "priest" or "monk" are words that are pretty ill fitting translations for the original Japanese/Chinese or Pali/Sanskrit terms imposed when Judeo-Christian vocabulary was used in the 19th century and earlier by Western missionaries to roughly translate concepts that are different in important ways. "Priest" carries the feeling of working some power to intervene with God/the spirits. In Japan, most Zen "monks" only reside in monasteries for periods as part of their training ... so both words are not good fits except when the person is actually residing in a monastery and might be described then as a "monk". Originally in India, the life of a wandering mendicant was anticipated, and this later transitioned into a more settled monastic model in India and the rest of Asia. These days, most Japanese Zen and other Buddhist clergy marry!

Malcolm wrote:

Only in Japan.

jundo cohen said:

The rest depends on whose Ordination Precepts are considered the most complete, encompassing and superior. The answer to that is, for each school looking at its own Precepts, all are complete and encompassing and equally superior. In the Soto School, we undertake 16 Bodhisattva Precepts, and we believe that such encompass the entire Vinaya. We believe that modern marriage is also a form of Celibacy if the heart is cleansed of greed, anger and divisive thoughts in ignorance in which people are seen as two.

Some other folks may show up in this thread and criticize our 16 Precepts and married ways as not legitimate. I say, stick to you own ways, interpretations and Precepts and keep your nose out of ours. As far as we are concerned, all Buddhist Clergy everywhere sit shoulder to shoulder ... no one more authentic or superior to another. Please keep your own views to yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

This again is a result of Japanese Buddhist history. The sheer number of sex scandals in which every important Japanese promulgator of Zen to America (except your own teacher, and perhaps Suzuki Roshi) has been involved points to the serious deficits in cultural understandings of Americans, our expectations, and indeed, in many cases, the ethical shortcomings (Eido Roshi, Sasaki Roshi, etc. come to mind) in the last generation of Japanese Buddhists who were instrumental in spreading Zen Buddhism to America and in many of their Western disciples (Gempo Roshi, etc.)

jundo cohen said:

Do not misunderstand the above to be some admission that we are "lay" ... for when we are Ordained, we are as Ordained as Ordained can be

Malcolm wrote:

But in the wider context of the Buddhist world, you are not, and never will be on par with a Bhikṣu/Bhikṣuni or a Bhikku/Bhikkuni, regardless of your standing within your own religious community. In a Tibetan setting, you might be seated among the bhikṣus out of desire to show respect or misunderstanding of your actual ordination, but from their point of view, you will never be part of the monastic Sangha, just like a Ngagpa like me isn't considered part of the monastic Sangha and will always be seated behind the monks. I think you will find the same attitude among Theravadins. Basically, if you have sex, you are not a bhikṣu. You can offer all kinds of fine reasons for why this isn't fair, is not accurate and so on, but in the eyes of the broader Buddhist world, while you may be an "ordinand" in the sense that you underwent a kind of ordination, it will never be regarded as serious as a bhikṣu ordination, or for the matter, even a śramaṇera (novice) ordination. Why? Because you drink wine, have a family, and continue, one supposes, to be sexually active.

This is not pointed out to you out of some wish to slight you or other Zen ordinands (and Tendai, Pure Land, Nichiren, etc. ordinands) or create a category of higher and lower, it is just that outside of the insular and historically unique world of Japanese Buddhism, this is how a majority of Buddhists see it.

Now from my point of view, I don't see much how the monastic Sangha can survive in a serious way in the west without corporate sponsorships (or ethnic community sponsorship), so indeed it is very likely that the lay ministry (to which you actually belong though you dispute the distinction) will come to dominate the way most Buddhist communities in the West are ministered, and this is not a bad thing. It is just not the same thing as having a community lead by celibate (and theoretically, ethically superior) monastic Sangha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 13th, 2016 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

skittles said:

Queequeg, you want me to kill myself because I can see with my own eyes that Ashkhenazi Jews are Europeans? Well guess what, it's not going to happen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 10:56 PM

Title: Re: Are zygotes humans?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Let me see if I understand what you are saying: You are saying that a zygote is a human being because a consciousness enters the zygote when the ovum is fertilised, but then the consciousness ceases and does not kick off again until the 24th week? Is that what you are saying?

Malcolm wrote:

It is latent, but present. In other words, a zygote has a faculty of body, mind, and a faculty of life, but since it has no sense organs, it cannot engage in any mental processes and there is no input to stimulate mental processes. Something like a candle in a room with no windows and no doors. In the 24th week, after the six sense gates are fully developed, it experiences pain and pleasure. You can make a direct equation in the chain of dependent origination in this way, from the point of conception, it is the link of consciousness; from then until the 24th week, name and form, after this we have six sense organs, contact, sensation, etc.

Karma Dorje said:

So without functioning sense organs and their fields, how do zygotes differ *at an experiential level* from any other aggregation of cells or conversely from any other bardo being without a physical body? We seem to only be differentiating based on the potential to develop these. Nobody gets upset at the cells that are killed during cancer surgery or an appendectomy, though surely even single cells have a mode of consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that the single cell formed from the merging of the spermatozoa and the ovum have been appropriated as a body by a consciousness seeking rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 10:49 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

kirtu said:

This again. Everyone was there and we all know that people charged into the Zen forum(s) and did exactly what Jundo claims. You were tarred with/accused of some of this but that was fallout from your objections to Nonin Chowaney, which were also standard Zen statements about Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the old "One moment of zazen is a moment of Buddhahood" debate. Well, we saw how Nonin Chowaney went on to erect an internet Zen regime infinitely more repressive than anything at E-Sangha, even our old buddy Jundo was purged.

Well, the entire history of Buddhadharma has never been free from challenges to "orthodoxy." Why should we begin now?

I mean, it is all well and good to have silos where people can waffle on and on unchallenged in anything they put forth, but occasional challenges to "orthodoxy" and "orthopraxy" are healthy. As you know, there is a great amount of polemics in Tibetan Buddhism.

You will observe I rarely drop into the Zen forum, but when I do, I really do.

So when someone produces the trope "Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow," we can just watch in bemusement as people waffle on with the standard verbiage, or we can inject some liveliness into the discussion with a challenge to the basic assumption the statement portends.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 9:18 PM

Title: Re: Which Longchen Rabjam text should I buy?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Any.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 6:51 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

skittles said:

It seems he has voted to send large sums of money to Israel, but then so has just about every politician that can because of AIPAC. An uncorrupt law enforcement would have found AIPAC illegal as it's a treasonous organization that harms American interests and interferes with our political processes.

Malcolm wrote:
I don't know why you think this.

skittles said:
In 1991, Sanders voted to withhold \$82.5 million in U.S. aid for Israel unless it stopped settlement activity in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. That motion was rejected on a 44-378 vote.

...

A decade later, he was the only Jewish member of Congress not to back a House resolution condemning the Palestinians and expressing solidarity with Israel after two Palestinian suicide attacks killed dozens. Sanders voted present, and the measure passed, 384-11.

...

Although he has recently tempered his criticisms of Israel, Sanders is still not considered an ally by Washington's pro-Israel community. Briggs did not respond to a question about when Sanders last visited Israel. And he has not recently spoken to AIPAC's annual conference, which reliably draws top Democrats who pledge their strong support for Israel's security.

...

And when word leaked in early 2015 that Netanyahu would deliver a March 2015 address to a joint meeting of Congress that was arranged by House Speaker John Boehner without the advance knowledge of the Obama White House, Sanders was the first senator to announce he would not attend the speech.

Malcolm wrote:
<http://www.politico.com/story/2016/01/bernie-sanders-israel-218149>

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 6:46 AM
Title: Re: Non Dem/Rep Candidates list
Content:
skittles said:

What non democrat/republican candidates have caught your eye?

Malcolm wrote:
Bernie, followed by Jill.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 6:41 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

skittles said:

So is Bernie an American Jew or an Israeli Jew?

Malcolm wrote:

He is an American Jew.

skittles said:

“Well, no, I do not have dual citizenship with Israel,” Sanders said. “I’m an American. I don’t know where that question came from. I am an American citizen, and I have visited Israel on a couple of occasions. No, I’m an American citizen, period.”

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.jpost.com/Diaspora/Where-does-Bernie-Sanders-the-Jewish-candidate-for-president-stand-on-Israel-412448>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: Are zygotes humans?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Just consciousness, not perception/sensation?

Malcolm wrote:

After the gandharva enters fertilized ovum(from allopathic pov), it becomes unconscious, without sensations until the 24th week, as above. In reality, all three things have to join together at once for conception to occur. And this is a universal doctrine in Buddhist sutras and tantras.

Sherab Dorje said:

Let me see if I understand what you are saying: You are saying that a zygote is a human being because a consciousness enters the zygote when the ovum is fertilised, but then the consciousness ceases and does not kick off again until the 24th week? Is that what you are saying?

Malcolm wrote:

It is latent, but present. In other words, a zygote has a faculty of body, mind, and a faculty of life, but since it has no sense organs, it cannot engage in any mental processes and there is no input to stimulate mental processes. Something like a candle in a room with no windows and no doors. In the 24th week, after the six sense gates are

fully developed, it experiences pain and pleasure. You can make a direct equation in the chain of dependent origination in this way, from the point of conception, it is the link of consciousness; from then until the 24th week, name and form, after this we have six sense organs, contact, sensation, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 4:32 AM

Title: Re: Are zygotes humans?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So, for you, a fertilised ovum is a human being?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course. It cannot be fertilized without the entrance of a gandharva. No gandharva, not conception.

Sherab Dorje said:

Just consciousness, not perception/sensation?

Malcolm wrote:

After the gandharva enters fertilized ovum(from allopathic pov), it becomes unconscious, without sensations until the 24th week, as above. In reality, all three things have to join together at once for conception to occur. And this is a universal doctrine in Buddhist sutras and tantras, as stated above, in the Medicine Tantra. Not sure why you are having a hard time with this. It is standard Buddhist doctrine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 4:02 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Unknown said:

In a study of 15 volunteers, all having positive experiences with psilocyben in the past, scientists noticed unconnected regions of the brain showing a connected behavior that was, otherwise, seemingly impossible. Long range connections were being made activity that were synchronized tightly in time; long-range connections that the brain is ordinarily incapable of. The scientists believed that, rather than a dreamlike state, produced only by a slowed brain, psilocyben was actually causing the brain to enter a state similar to synesthesia (a sensory condition in which certain sense stimuli are paired with another). This is why people on psilocyben may report seeing color while listening to music or hearing sounds while looking at certain things.

Malcolm wrote:

<https://www.minds.com/blog/view/549409458833334272>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Are zygotes humans?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because a gandharva, a consciousness seeking rebirth, has entered the fertilized ovum.

Sherab Dorje said:

So, for you, a fertilised ovum is a human being?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course. It cannot be fertilized without the entrance of a gandharva. No gandharva, not conception.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 3:27 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

jundo cohen said:

And where do I get such an assertion? Not only from Zen doctrine. By pure chance or Karma (really completely unintended by me), when I reached in almost at random to the library of Tibetan resources online and copied earlier an obscure (to me anyway) text to show the difficulty of insider lingo, I happened to take this one by Tilopa ...

Malcolm wrote:

Which is not a practice open to ordained monks. They are barred from using a karmamudra and must instead rely on what is termed a jñānamudra.

jundo cohen said:

Well, not all Tibetan Teachers seem to agree with you on that.

Actually, they do.

However, it is outside my field. I have great GREAT criticisms and doubts about the whole Practice anyway, but since I am an outsider to Tibetan Buddhism I will keep my mouth shut, and not go over to that thread and set you all right about how wrong it is.

Malcolm wrote:

According to the great Dzogchen master Longchenpa, (14th century) such practices exist primarily for people with too much desire, as a distraction, until they are ready for real practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

jundo cohen said:

And where do I get such an assertion? Not only from Zen doctrine. By pure chance or Karma (really completely unintended by me), when I reached in almost at random to the library of Tibetan resources online and copied earlier an obscure (to me anyway) text to show the difficulty of insider lingo, I happened to take this one by Tilopa ...

Malcolm wrote:

Which is not a practice open to ordained monks. They are barred from using a karmamudra and must instead rely on what is termed a jñānamudra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: Are zygotes humans?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I mean it in the same sense we say a seed is viable, i.e., given proper conditions it will produce a plant.

Sherab Dorje said:

Fair enough. In which case we can say that a zygote MAY be viable given proper conditions. Does that make it a human though?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because a gandharva, a consciousness seeking rebirth, has entered the fertilized ovum.

If the zygote is not viable, it will not survive implantation. But conception cannot occur without three things, as the Medical Tantra states:

First, from a man and women's non-defective semen and blood, and a consciousness impelled by action and affliction, the five elements assemble, the cause of conception, in the womb. For example, it is equivalent with fire produced from fire sticks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: Are zygotes humans?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

They can also be frozen, kind of a hellish bardo state, but what the hell. Samsara.

Mother's Lap said:

The being is unconscious at that point in gestation isn't it?

kirtu said:

I don't know why Malcolm affirmed this.

Malcolm wrote:

It is because the gandharva has only three indriyas when it enters the fertilized ovum, according to the The Nanda-garbhavakranti-sūtra:

Nanda, in the nineteenth week, the four organs of the fetus in the womb mother's womb, the eyes, the ears, the nose, and the tongue fully formed. In the beginning when entering the womb initially only three faculties were attained, these being the body, life and mind.

Sensations, according to Desri Sangye Gyatso's commentary on the Medicine Tanta, occur only in the 24th week:

In the twenty-fourth month the "moving everywhere" wind clear matures the functional and hollow organs. At that time, also the thoughts of happiness and suffering, the objects of sensation, become known.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: Are zygotes humans?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

They are viable since when they are implanted a human being comes out.

Sherab Dorje said:

Sorry dude, but without the presence of a functioning uterus they are not viable. No matter how you frame it.

Queen Elizabeth II said:

I sense that the two of you are just using 'viable' in different ways. In one sense it means capable of maintaining a separate existence, and so would only apply to a child after birth or one in the womb that had developed enough that it could survive if born prematurely. But in another and more recent sense it simply means capable of growing and developing and would apply to any fertilized ovum, even one in a petri dish. The former sense is the dominant one in embryology and the latter in botany (esp. with regard to seeds) but sometimes the latter is used even in embryology.

Malcolm wrote:

I mean it in the same sense we say a seed is viable, i.e., given proper conditions it will produce a plant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

jundo cohen said:

In the Japanese lines, we believe that our Ordinations stand head and shoulders ... not in front nor behind ... with Buddhist Ordinations of any kind any where on the continent. Most Japanese priests do not consider themselves lay persons, nor less than any Buddhist Ordained anywhere. Please respect that ... in any section of this Pan-Buddhist Forum, but especially here.

Malcolm wrote:

And as I explained at the time, the issue was how to negotiate this within the wider context of the Buddhist world where the term monk = celibate ordinand.

Hell, Jundo, I also have special vows which are not part and partial of what average Tibetan people who practice Vajrayāna follow, since I am an ordained "Ngagpa," which is something somewhat comparable to a Shugendo priest. So I don't cut my hair (it's a commitment), among other things, as a sign of my ordination. But I am not a monastic, even though I am "ordained."

Monastic ordination was quite changed by Saicho, who dispensed with Hinayāna ordinations, and by the time the nineteenth century rolled around, there really was no such thing as a bhikṣu in Japan anymore.

But within the wider world of Buddhism, there remains a celibate ordination, and this was the original path that Buddha taught. Even Mahākashyapa was a celibate monk. Outside of the little world of Soto and Rinzai Zen, this is what you have to negotiate.

But just as external signs cannot indicate to someone who is a buddha and who is not, likewise, external signs of ordination cannot indicate who is a "beggar" (bhikṣu) and who is not. It is better to give up robes and trappings, since they are really just traps.

jundo cohen said:

I mean, you consider yourself a doctor and healer of sorts, although it is an unusual and unorthodox (outside its little part of the world) field of medicine your Practice. I respect that.

Malcolm wrote:

There is not much difference between what I do, and what internists do today, I mostly listen, make sure my patients have seen Western doctors with regard to their complaints, etc., and help out with things that Tibetan Medicine and Ayurveda are good at addressing.

Western Medicine advanced beyond the level of Tibetan Medicine and Ayurveda

because of the invention of anesthesia and then Xrays, primarily. But circa, 1850, it was actually quite behind Tibetan Medicine in particular, since Tibetan Medicine has a germ theory of disease, understood circulation, the nervous system, and all of this understanding dates back to the 9th century CE at least.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: Dorje Drollo Practice

Content:

conebeckham said:

But I don't know if this is the case in CNNR's system.

Malcolm wrote:

Generally, you have to "produce the function of the main mantra", which you test by applying the action mantra after doing a retreat of a week, two weeks, three weeks. If it does not work, then more main mantra is required. And generally, if you manage to produce the function of one mantra, all other mantras will be easier to accomplish.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

jundo cohen said:

The Buddha is completely free of afflictions, and he is us. In a moment of awakening there is all modes of knowledge. There is no suffering, no actions, no afflictions. I am claiming Buddhahood for myself, yourself, hisself and sheself ... all no self.

Malcolm wrote:

Reality check...

This said by a guy who once threatened to sue people whose words on the internet he did not like.

Conduct is the gauge of view and meditation. It is how one checks one's progress.

M

jundo cohen said:

No, I simply complained about another now defunct Buddhist forum where admins and moderators and folks such as yourself would regularly come into the Zen section, offer your criticisms of Zen doctrines, then delete explanations of Zen doctrine from actual

Zen folks that you did not agree with. Some of the criticisms of Zen schools and practices were quite prejudiced, especially when presented without opportunity for rebuttal. At least here, you charge into the Zen section and offer your criticisms and opinions on Zen schools you do not belong to and teachings you do not understand, but we Zen folks at least get to say something in the Zen section without censorship. That is a big step in the right direction. In the old days, you would also tell new folks interested in Zen Buddhism about all that was wrong with Zen Buddhism, without telling them that you were not yourself a Zen Buddhism (in fact, leading many of them to believe you were, since you did so in the Zen Section. You guys pulled all kinds of games like that. My complaining about it got me banished, and thus ...

... but all past history.

(I have been told that am not allowed here to go into the Tibetan Buddhist sections to offer my criticisms of Tibetan Buddhism by the way, not that I would. So, you can come here, but I cannot go there and do the same, not that I would. Still, does not seem fair).

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:

I am not offering criticisms of Zen. I am offering critiques of your and Astus' statements.

That was not my policy, and for the record, I never deleted any one's explanations of anything. What other mods did then, not my actions nor my problem.

The rest of your charges, frankly, are as false as they are indemonstrable.

For the record, the basic dispute that you and I had, you will recall, was over the question of whether Zen Priests with only bodhisattva vows were actually distinguishable from any average Tibetan lay person who had also taken bodhisattva vows. Our disagreement was over what consisted of a monastic ordination. As such, you regarded it as a challenge to your authority as a monastic (it was) and went ballistic (understandable for a person still dominated by afflictions).

I rest my case.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are a bundle of afflictions who continually blunders through samsara because your afflictions generate actions which result in your own suffering.

Astus said:

That's it! We look at ourselves and see only all sorts of mundane, vulgar, basic, coarse, and totally ordinary things. While at the same time we think the Buddha is completely the opposite. The path is to go from mundane to supramundane, from delusion to enlightenment. As for the paths, in Zen there are all sorts of ways to categorise teachings, but the ultimate one is always sudden enlightenment. Among other things it means realising that afflictions are bodhi, to quote a general Mahayana concept. It also means the insight into the dharmas being unborn.

Malcolm wrote:

Very easy words to have on your lips, but if you still act out those afflictions, the afflictions are not bodhi, they are just afflictions.

There are hundreds and thousands of texts written about this, but at the end of the day, if you are churning out verbiage with no change in yourself, then, you are just a parrot.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

jundo cohen said:

The Buddha is completely free of afflictions, and he is us. In a moment of awakening there is all modes of knowledge. There is no suffering, no actions, no afflictions. I am claiming Buddhahood for myself, yourself, hisself and sheself ... all no self.

Malcolm wrote:

Reality check...

This said by a guy who once threatened to sue people whose words on the internet he did not like.

Conduct is the gauge of view and meditation. It is how one checks one's progress.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 12th, 2016 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Au contraire, the Buddha was quite different from us. He was completely free from all afflictions, and had knowledge of all modes of awakening. Can you say the same? If not, then you must admit you and the Buddha are different.

Astus said:

What am I and what is the Buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

You are a bundle of afflictions who continually blunders through samsara because your afflictions generate actions which result in your own suffering.

If you deny this, you are either being dishonest, or claiming Buddhahood for yourself, which is also probably a lie, because I cannot imagine a buddha would waste their time on Dharmawheel.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 11th, 2016 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Astus said:

As I have written here before, the point of stating that "Just recognize that Shakyamuni was an ordinary old fellow." is to know (識得) that he was no different from us.

Malcolm wrote:

Au contraire, the Buddha was quite different from us. He was completely free from all afflictions, and had knowledge of all modes of awakening.

Can you say the same? If not, then you must admit you and the Buddha are different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 11th, 2016 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Queequeg said:

Bernie has a problem on immigration. His economic platform is basically socialist economic nationalism (conceptually similar to Trump's policy, but aesthetically more polished). No matter how you cut it, unrestrained immigration of low skilled workers undermines an economic nationalist agenda. We can't have good wages and and strong social net policies if there is also a bottomless pool of labor and open enrollment for all comers, legal or illegal - and you can't really turn people away from the programs once they're in the country. These social programs will bankrupt us unless we strictly limit access.

Malcolm wrote:

Bernie opposed 2007 immigration reform for exactly the reasons he stated: the guest worker program amounts to indentured servitude and it causes American workers to

join a race to the bottom in wages.

<https://berniesanders.com/issues/a-fair-and-humane-immigration-policy/>

<https://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/immigration-reform/>

You can see that Sanders plan is much more comprehensive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 10th, 2016 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Simon E. said:

Well, I had dealings with 8 or 9 people who had such episodes following that festival.

Malcolm wrote:

I wonder how many of them were later diagnosed schizophrenic or bipolar?

Simon E. said:

These to the best of my recollection were not suffering from any of the major psychoses, and the episodes that they reported did not lead to any of those psychoses. But were highly distressing.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure. But in my case, when I noticed that I could see patterns and traces days and weeks after tripping, I thought it was cool -- it never worried me. But you know, I was highly self-educated about psychedelics before I started taking them. I read Kesey, Don Juan, etc. when I was eleven. And of course when I started tripping at age 13 (1975-76), I was fully convinced it was for spiritual reasons. Forward, never straight!!!

Simon E. said:

On a lighter note, a colleague was on duty at Reading Rock in the 'Bad Trip Tent' when the tent collapsed in a thunder storm. The ensuing screaming pandemonium can only be imagined.

Malcolm wrote:

Now that is freaking hilarious...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 10th, 2016 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I like to call it Sanders' Northern Strategy. Clinton was convinced that the Black vote was going to sail her into the White House, but she forgot that 43% of the electorate is Independent. Clinton won the Dem vote by 16% last night in Mich, but it was independents who gave Sanders the win.

DGA said:

On the significance of the Sanders win in the Michigan primary:

<https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/what-the-stunning-bernie-sanders-win-in-michigan-means/>

my colleague Nate Silver went back and found that only one primary, the 1984 Democratic primary in New Hampshire, was even on the same scale as this upset. In that contest, the polling average had Walter Mondale beating Gary Hart by 17 percentage points, but it was Hart who won, with slightly more than 9 percentage points over Mondale.

Indeed, my initial thought was to compare the Sanders upset with Clinton's over Barack Obama in the 2008 New Hampshire Democratic primary, but that undersells what happened Tuesday night. I was in New Hampshire when Clinton won in 2008 and sat in stunned disbelief — Obama lost by about 3 percentage points, when the polling average had him ahead by 8 percentage points. In other words, tonight's error was more than double what occurred eight years ago.

And to put THAT into context, Sanders still lost on the evening overall in terms of delegates, because Clinton overwhelmingly won Mississippi. I think it's safe to say that Sanders has momentum and that the really unfavorable states for Sanders have already voted.

When the "superdelegates" already pledged to Clinton begin to peel away and commit to Sanders, then it will be clear to everyone that the machine is starting to view a Sanders victory as somewhere on a spectrum from "likely" to "immanent."

Parenthetically, I find it contemptible that a party that calls itself "Democratic" has such a ridiculously undemocratic system for selecting a nominee. Superdelegates? Really?

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Superdelegate>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 10th, 2016 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

My experience tells me otherwise.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess I just don't believe you, Greg.

Sherab Dorje said:
Too bad...

Malcolm wrote:
HPPD is one thing, but full blown "Oh god, now I am tripping, I wish I could come down...." kind of flashback, no, I don't believe this, and there is simply no scientific evidence to support the existence of such a phenomena.

If something like this happened to you, well, I think someone maliciously dosed you (it does happen, and more than you think).

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, March 10th, 2016 at 2:14 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen, varjayana and being a monk/ nun
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
Oh, there is power in being a monastic in Asia, if you think otherwise, well...as I said, follow the money...also the idea that monastics living in monasteries are not interested in girls...well if you think that is true, I have a bridge for sale in Brooklyn...real cheap...

Sherab Dorje said:
Well, there is nothing wrong with being interested in girls, it is what you do with girls that has bearing on whether the title "monastic" fits or not.

Malcolm wrote:
From personal knowledge, I can tell you that so called Tibetan monastics do a lot with girls, especially the teenage ones...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, March 10th, 2016 at 2:09 AM
Title: Re: AYAHUASCA
Content:

Simon E. said:
Sorry Malcolm.

I have vivid memories of dealing with the fallout from one particular Reading Rock Festival (one of the UK's biggest) where particularly pure acid was freely available. TWO YEARS later we were still having referrals of young men (mostly) whose ongoing hallucinatory episodes dated from that time and place. It's all well described in the literature.

Malcolm wrote:
This is anecdotal, Simon, like the rest of the flashback phenomena. I have been around people who used LSD all of my life (literally), and I have never, ever once, among the

people I know (between the ages of 50 and 80) who took (a lot of) LSD back in the day, met even a single person who suffered from "ongoing hallucinatory episodes" unless they were schizophrenic.

So, regardless of what the literature might say about it dating from the early 70's. I suspect it is attended by a great deal of misinformation and hysteria. With all due respect.

DGA said:

I know one person who has, to the present, a temporarily distorted visual field whenever the lights go down in a theater (among other triggers) that he attributes directly to a very strong self-administration of good ol' LSD. Tracers and so on.

The brain is very complex. The truth is that neuroscience is only now coming to grips with how complex the brain is, and therefore how little they actually know about it. Who knows what is behind these experiences?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is called HPPD. From the article I posted:

Hallucinogen Persisting Perception Disorder (HPPD), the clinical term for seeing weird, trippy things like geometric hallucinations, flashes of color, afterimages and false perceptions of movement after taking psychedelics. To be considered a candidate for HPPD, the type of visual phenomena that occurs during an acid trip has to spontaneously reappear "long after the use of hallucinogens has stopped," cause significant distress, and not be explainable by any other mental disorder or medical condition. For many, it's less of a sudden "flashback" and more of a continuous disturbance of vision.

This is not a flashback.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 10th, 2016 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Oh come on, give me a break. There is no such thing. A memory of tripping is not a flashback.

Sherab Dorje said:

My experience tells me otherwise.

Malcolm wrote:

I guess I just don't believe you, Greg.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 10th, 2016 at 1:59 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

DGA said:

There's a recent thread around here in which Astus, Jundo, and some others discussed the relative merits of using the elaborate discursive forms that are impossible to translate of classical Ch'an literature, or attempting to speak plainly. I can't find it because I suck at the internet, but I assure you all, it was a winner.

As near as I can tell and working from limited experience, the Zen teaching situation is in part about creating a kind of context for encountering something. So all kinds of outrageous and confusing things can happen: the teacher charges in and kills a cat in front of everyone, for example. What was THAT about? I think the attempts to mobilize the literary figures of ancient Ch'an masters in the present are attempts to introduce someone to this kind of learning environment. Whether it's effective or not is knowable only after the fact--if it worked on the intended audience.

Malcolm wrote:

Its off topic, I know, but this is why I like the terse style of Indo-Tibetan texts, more like an algebra of liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 10th, 2016 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Simon E. said:

Sorry Malcolm.

I have vivid memories of dealing with the fallout from one particular Reading Rock Festival (one of the UK's biggest) where particularly pure acid was freely available. TWO YEARS later we were still having referrals of young men (mostly) whose ongoing hallucinatory episodes dated from that time and place. It's all well described in the literature.

Malcolm wrote:

This is anecdotal, Simon, like the rest of the flashback phenomena. I have been around people who used LSD all of my life (literally), and I have never, ever once, among the people I know (between the ages of 50 and 80) who took (a lot of) LSD back in the day, met even a single person who suffered from "ongoing hallucinatory episodes" unless they were schizophrenic.

So, regardless of what the literature might say about it dating from the early 70's. I suspect it is attended by a great deal of misinformation and hysteria. With all due respect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 10th, 2016 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are no such thing as flashbacks. I ought to know. Do you have any idea how many times I tripped when I was a kid?

Sherab Dorje said:

I have had flashbacks. I know. Do you have any idea how many times I tripped when I was a kid?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh come on, give me a break. There is no such thing. A memory of tripping is not a flash back.

<http://www.popsci.com/science/article/2013-08/fyi-can-acid-trip-really-give-you-flashbacks>

Sherab Dorje said:

And though scientists know HPPD exists, they still don't know exactly what causes it.

"I've spent my life studying this problem and I don't know, is the short answer," Abraham says. "There are a number of clues--they come back to the core concept, it's an imbalance within the inhibitory circuits of the visual processing system."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 10th, 2016 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, varjayana and being a monk/ nun

Content:

conebeckham said:

Who said anything about money, or cars, or girls?

Sherab Dorje said:

Me! What's a career if it doesn't land you money, power or chicks?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, there is power in being a monastic in Asia, if you think otherwise, well...as I said, follow the money...also the idea that monastics living in monasteries are not interested in girls...well if you think that is true, I have a bridge for sale in Brooklyn...real cheap...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 10th, 2016 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Are zygotes humans?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

They can also be frozen, kind of a hellish bardo state, but what the hell. Samsara.

Mother's Lap said:

The being is unconscious at that point in gestation isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, but who said hell was only a sensation?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 10th, 2016 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, varjayana and being a monk/ nun

Content:

conebeckham said:

Alright, I'm not Malcolm.....

But I feel qualified to comment. Two of my brothers-in-law are monks. I have spent a good deal of time with Tibetan monks in monasteries, and with ex-monks as well. Some of my best friends were monks, frankly.

If one understands by "career paths" a lifestyle and culture that allows for basic human necessities to be met (food, shelter, clothing, social interaction), in exchange for living within the rules and structure of monastic life, it should be clear that being a monk is indeed a "career path." Some monks work for the monastery for their entire lives, in exchange for these necessities. Some go on to become Lamas, which, frankly, is also a career path.

Here in the West, for the most part, we don't have the monastic infrastructure that will support careers like these. But for centuries a monastic career has been a viable choice for Tibetans and those in the Himalayan region in general. (Mostly men, I must say.....before anyone rushes to point it out).

There is a high incidence of monasticism in Buddhist countries--not merely in Vajrayana countries. That's a point worth understanding.

Sherab Dorje said:

I don't buy it my dear Cone. There are MUCH easier ways to make money.

MUCH, MUCH easier ways that also provide many more fringe benefits (cars, girls, etc...)

Malcolm wrote:

Just follow the money, Greg.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 10th, 2016 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Are zygotes humans?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Generally yes, since they are all viable human births.

Sherab Dorje said:

They are not viable, they are in a petri dish for crying out loud, how can they be viable without the presence of uterus???

Malcolm wrote:

They are viable since when they are implanted a human being comes out. They can also be frozen, kind of a hellish bardo state, but what the hell. Samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 10th, 2016 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is also absolutely no evidence whatsoever that LSD can "damage the brain." This is pure propaganda. Total nonsense. When you take LSD, the the plasma half life of the drug is about 5 hours, and generally most measurable traces are gone the body within 24 hours.

Sherab Dorje said:

With the emphasis on the term "measurable". What about LSD metabolites though? And how do you explain "flashbacks"?

Malcolm wrote:

Metabolites are gone within with two weeks.

There are no such thing as flashbacks. I ought to know. Do you have any idea how many times I tripped when I was a kid?

```
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: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 10th, 2016 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha made the precept against alcohol because some people can't handle their booze. If you can handle your booze, what is the point of following that precept?

Sherab Dorje said:

If you can "handle your booze", ie only become slightly intoxicated, then that's okay? I don't remember the Buddha saying anywhere that some degrees of intoxication are wholesome, and other degrees are not. But what is the point of drinking if it doesn't effect you anyway? Let's face it: people normally drink to get intoxicated, except in some rare cases where they want to savor the flavour. But if you just want the flavour then a sip is enough, correct? Wine tasters go as far as to spit out the sip they take.

Malcolm wrote:

Greg, the Buddha said in the Medicine Tantra:

Alcohol is sweet, sour, bitter, its post-digestive taste is sour. It is sharp, warm, rough, subtle, and slightly laxative. It ignites warmth, generates conviviality, increases sleep, and removes phlegm and wind.

Overuse alters the mind, one lacks shame, and modesty is destroyed. The first kind of drunk stays in shameless places, overcome by evil thoughts, he thinks he is happy. The second kind of drunk is like an intoxicated elephant, committing misdeeds and staying in places that violate his discipline. The final kind of drunk is mindless and lies like a corpse, not knowing anything at all, like a place of darkness.

Then of course there is Longchenpa's famous praise to booze, where he shows that a) alcohol has many praiseworthy qualities and b) there are a lot of Buddhist hypocrites out there who drink but like to pretend they do not in public.

My goal in drinking wine is conviviality and warmth. Your mileage may vary. I am aware of the faults of overuse. Wine tasters spit because when you are tasting three hundred wines, well, you get the picture.

Sherab Dorje said:

And even alcohol is permissible to monks who are ill, as medicine.

And heroin is a great analgesic... So what? Now you are being obtuse. Nobody said that medicinal use is negative. It is one thing to smoke dope (for example) in order to relieve chronic pain caused by cancer and another thing to get baked every night in front of the t.v.

Therefore, I see no reason at all why psychedelics cannot play a valid and useful role in many conditions where recent research seems to indicate that there is much benefit from them.

I don't think anybody argued to the contrary. And, to tell you the truth, if Garab Dorje was my teacher and he said "Hey Greg, drop this tab. It'll help your practice." Who am I to argue? But the reality is that I have not come across a single legit teacher that is into dealing DMT and LSD. Have you?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, famously there is Trungpa. And I have heard of other teachers who have tripped with their students, but I won't say who.

Sherab Dorje said:

Then of course, in the Amazon, Ayahuasca is mainly sought out by people for healing purposes, and the general role of shamans is healing (but not only that). It is very different from the fad of pharmahausca in the US and so on, where the substance has been removed from its cultural context.

And that, my dear Malcolm, is the problem: the Western (urban, in most cases) Shaman scene is a minefield of quacks, full of half-baked mix and match spirituality, that requires the use of drugs in order to elicit experiences that starry eyes neophytes consider spiritually valid. ie to legitimate the scene's existence. But as we know VERY well that in Buddhism, experiences are no big deal. Actually they can be real obstacles on the path. So...

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

Experiences are never a problem, understanding them is the problem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 10th, 2016 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha made the precept against alcohol because some people can't handle their booze. If you can handle your booze, what is the point of following that precept?

Ayu said:

Because - for some people - alcohol affects the mind even subtly, so that the spiritual practice gets disturbed. They might be able to handle the booze but drinking makes them aggressive nevertheless.

Malcolm wrote:

If booze makes someone aggressive, they can't handle their booze. But most of the people I know become happy, friendly and relaxed with a glass of wine or two, or even three.

Ayu said:

And hallucinogenes are not less dangerous, even if they do not create a physical addiction. The brain and its functions can be damaged seriously, not only for the abuser but for his offspring also.

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that LSD and so on can create genetic damage is total nonsense, debunked years ago. Of course, if you bathe cells in pure LSD for weeks, you will see chromosome

damage, the same can be said of milk or any ACIDIC substance. But the average dose of LSD, 100 micrograms, is far too small to create teratogenic effects, even in pregnant women.

There is also absolutely no evidence whatsoever that LSD can "damage the brain." This is pure propaganda. Total nonsense. When you take LSD, the plasma half life of the drug is about 5 hours, and generally most measurable traces are gone from the body within 24 hours.

LSD is a serotonin agonist, which is why when people are having bad LSD experiences (yes, it does happen), they are generally given serotonin antagonists such as Clozapine, etc. because of their action on 5-HT_{2A/2b} receptors in the brain — LSD, etc., are 5-HT_{2A} agonists.

For whom is LSD risky? People with histories of schizophrenia in the family who take the drug in their late teens and early twenties are at risk of unmasking undiagnosed schizophrenia, when schizophrenia typically expresses itself anyway. Present research on schizophrenia indicates that in patients at risk for schizophrenia, the brain does not sever neural connections used in brain development in people 18-6 because the switch that tells the brain to sever hormonally those connections is not turned on, and so therefore, there are a large number of neuronal connections in the brain which are still active in adult schizophrenics which do not exist for those whose brains developed normally. Therefore, when people express schizophrenia from taking LSD, this should be regarded as a symptom in a differential diagnosis, rather than a cause. In short, there is absolutely no evidence at all that people who are not at risk will develop schizophrenia from taking LSD, let alone any other brain based malady of mental illness, such as bipolar disorder. Thus, the conclusion is that if you have a family history of schizophrenia, bipolar disorder and so on, perhaps it is better if you abstain from LSD and other psychedelics. Similarly, if you have a family history of alcoholism, it is probably better that you do not drink.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 10th, 2016 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Anders said:

Although the only Chinese comments we have cited here are pretty plain spoken.

Malcolm wrote:

I was referring to the replies.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 9th, 2016 at 11:21 PM

Title: Re: Are zygotes humans?

Content:

MiphamFan said:

So Buddhists shouldn't do that kind of IVF?

Apparently the zygotes can be stored and donated

Malcolm wrote:

If they do, they should donate the other zygotes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 9th, 2016 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: Are zygotes humans?

Content:

MiphamFan said:

Would zygotes be considered human life under Vajrayana embryology?

Would IVF treatments which involve generating multiple zygotes and only implanting one be against Dharma?

Malcolm wrote:

Generally yes, since they are all viable human births.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 9th, 2016 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: Buddha is an Ordinary Fellow

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is pretty clear from these statements, that "Buddha is an ordinary guy" simple means that the conduct of the Buddha, an awakened person, was completely unfabricated.

Jeez, you Zen guys make everything so damn complicated and wordy. Must be a Chinese cultural thing.

Astus said:

From Jingde Chuandeng Lu, vol 14 (T51n2076, p311, a4-17):

Zen master Danxia Tianran entered the hall and addressed the monks, saying, "All of you here must take care of the temple and monastery. Things in this place were not made or named by you, and have they not been given as offerings? Formerly I studied with Shitou, and he taught me that I must personally protect these things. This is not to be discussed further.

Each of you here has a place to put your cushion and sit. Why do you suspect you need something else? Is Zen something you can explain? Is a buddha something you can become? I don't want to hear a single word about Buddhism.

All of you, look and see! Skillful means and expedience, the unlimited mind of benevolence, compassion, joy, and detachment—these things aren't received from someplace else. Not an inch of these things is evident. Skillful means is Manjushri Bodhisattva. Expedience is Samantabhadra Bodhisattva. Do you still want to go seeking after something? Don't go using the Buddhist scriptures to look for emptiness! These days Zen students are all in a tizzy, practicing Zen and asking about Tao. I don't have any Dharma for you to practice here! And there isn't any doctrine to be confirmed. Just eat and drink. Everyone can do that. Don't harbor doubt. It's the same everywhere! Just recognize that Shakyamuni was an ordinary old fellow. You must see for yourself. Don't spend your life trying to win some competitive trophy, blindly misleading other blind people, all of you marching right into hell, floundering in duality! I've nothing more to say. Take care!"

(tr. A. Ferguson: Zen's Chinese Heritage, p 129)

Alternative translation by Beishi Guohan:

Chan Master Danxia Tianran entered the hall and said,
"All of you here have to take good care of your own spiritual treasury, which is not attainable through labeling and describing by the effortful-effort of your deluded mind, and there is even no need to talk about attainment and non-attainment. ... You neither need to rely on the sutras and teachings, nor to fall into nothingness. These days Chan practitioners are all in a tizzy, investigating Chan and inquiring into the Way. Here in my place, there is no Way to be cultivated and no Dharma to be realized. Merely drink when you're thirsty and eat when you're hungry by way of clear awareness without self-referential deluded thinking. Just always act with this Mind in all places in your daily life to realize that Shakyamuni is the ordinary person."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 9th, 2016 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Greg, intoxicants are not inherently unwholesome, nor is taking them.

Sherab Dorje said:

Nothing is inherently anything. The precept against intoxication is the sole precept which is a precept based on prohibition rather than being based on the ten natural non virtues. And you know, what, like all five lay precepts, it is optional whether or not one wants to follow it.

Sure. But it's not like the Buddha woke up one day and said to himself: "Hmmmmmm... I think I'll make up a totally arbitrary and useless rule so that people in the future can argue as to whether it is applicable or not..." Somehow I think his choice would have been based on logic and concern for sentient beings, not out of a cruel whim to torment us. And yes, of course observing any of the precepts is completely optional, the results that arise from not observing them though are compulsory.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha made the precept against alcohol because some people can't handle their booze. If you can handle your booze, what is the point of following that precept?

And even alcohol is permissible to monks who are ill, as medicine. Therefore, I see no reason at all why psychedelics cannot play a valid and useful role in many conditions where recent research seems to indicate that there is much benefit from them. Then of course, in the Amazon, Ayahuasca is mainly sought out by npeople for healing purposes, and the general role of shamans is healing (but not only that). It is very different from the fad of pharmahausca in the US and so on, where the substance has been removed from its cultural context.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 9th, 2016 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, varjayana and being a monk/ nun

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

That's false. There's no real liberation without the practice of Highest Yoga Tantra since it is impossible to abandon self-grasping ignorance completely without engaging in completion stage meditation.

Malcolm wrote:

Take it up with the Buddha. The difference is not in ultimate liberation, but rather length of time to liberation.

Tsongkhapafan said:

That's also incorrect. The only path that leads directly to liberation and enlightenment is Highest Yoga Tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

If you mean in a single lifetime from soup to nuts, then we agree. But if you mean that the other paths of the six lower vehicles do not lead to buddhahood, not only are we in disagreement, but you have slandered the Dharma, and in particular the Dharma taught in the Dzogchen tantras. Think carefully before replying.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 9th, 2016 at 11:30 AM

Title: Re: Vain enough to give, not generous enough to receive

Content:

maybay said:

Question is, why do we wait until we're dead to be generous?

Malcolm wrote:

Taxes.

maybay said:

Even death wont protect you from taxes. But is it a calculating decision or just an unquestioned social norm? Buddhists are excited to claim Jobs as their own. But I wonder about a person who will only give once the offering is useless to them. They've given nothing.

Malcolm wrote:

Calculated decision. Inheritances are taxed differently than income.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 9th, 2016 at 11:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, varjayana and being a monk/ nun

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

I saw many Nyingma Tulkus in my live and they were all monks. Maybe some Tulkus were also Tertons and therefore non monks. Who knows which more non monks combinations we could have in Nyingma, to prove that the status of non monk is satisfying to certain Dzogchen views, which i doubt greatly as Bonpo Dzogchenpa.
[/color]

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that the teachings that Nyingmapas practice are all terma.

Also, in Nyingma, status of Ngagpas and Monks are the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 9th, 2016 at 11:17 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, varjayana and being a monk/ nun

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Not only this, but each of the nine yānas is an independent means of liberation, self-contained and self-sufficient.

Tsongkhapafan said:

That's false. There's no real liberation without the practice of Highest Yoga Tantra since it is impossible to abandon self-grasping ignorance completely without engaging in completion stage meditation.

Malcolm wrote:

Take it up with the Buddha. The difference is not in ultimate liberation, but rather length of time to liberation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 9th, 2016 at 10:29 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, varjayana and being a monk/ nun

Content:

qwerty13 said:

So what is the advantage of being a monk in one of the traditions of tibetan buddhism?

kalden yungdrung said:

Without being a monk, like certain Dzogchenpas think, that could be a Master too. Well that could be an exception but is certain not the standard in the Tibetan Traditions.

Y

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, this is not true in Nyingma, where the most important lineage holders are Tertons, who almost always are not monks. And you cannot be a terton unless you are a master of Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 9th, 2016 at 6:32 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, varjayana and being a monk/ nun

Content:

Virgo said:

For a Vajrayana or Dzogchen practitioner it is unnecessary and arbitrary.

Sherab Dorje said:

Arbitrary? You must be fraking joking!? How do you explain the incredibly high incidence of monasticism in Vajrayana countries then???

Malcolm wrote:

Career paths.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 9th, 2016 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

So underlying issues are the cause when meditation is the topic, but in the case of psychedelics it's the drugs themselves? Excuse me while I boggle.

Sherab Dorje said:

If you cannot discern between wholesome and the unwholesome actions, then that is your issue to deal with and not mine.

If you believe that the techniques taught by the Buddha are the same as dropping a tab, then that is your issue and not mine.

If you want to be responsible for spreading confusion and ignorance, go for it...

You are obviously well beyond dualism, I personally am not.

Malcolm wrote:

Greg, intoxicants are not inherently unwholesome, nor is taking them. The precept against intoxication is the sole precept which is a precept based on prohibition rather than being based on the ten natural non virtues. And you know, what, like all five lay precepts, it is optional whether or not one wants to follow it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 9th, 2016 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, varjayana and being a monk/ nun

Content:

R said:

Malcolm,

yes.

Malcolm wrote:

With due respect to your esteemed lamas, I don't agree with them. My esteemed guru, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, has a different opinion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 9th, 2016 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, varjayana and being a monk/ nun

Content:

R said:

It's easier to practice, if you're a monk. I think I've asked that from at least three lamas.

And now that I'm married and have three kids, I kind of agree with it.

Malcolm wrote:

Easier where? Easier when you are in a busy monastery? Easier when you are western monk having work full time, pay rent? And who says lay people must have kids? I dont.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 8th, 2016 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, varjayana and being a monk/ nun

Content:

Kelwin said:

Yup. And to do that, it might be extremely useful to become a monk.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends very much on the person, the time and the place.

Kelwin said:

Agreed, hence I said 'might be'. Just saying that understanding Dzogchen, and experiencing it to some degree, doesn't mean being a monk cannot be useful to actually progress to stable realisation.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually given how restricted a monastic life is, it will undoubtedly serve as a barrier for most Western people when it comes to working with circumstances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 8th, 2016 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

And another thing ... Renowned scholar and activist Noam Chomsky declared this week that the GOP and its far-right front-runners are "literally a serious danger to decent human survival."

Speaking with The Huffington Post on Monday, Chomsky cited the Republican Party's refusal to tackle—or even acknowledge—the “looming environmental catastrophe” of climate change, thereby “dooming our grandchildren.” ...

<http://www.alternet.org/election-2016/noam-chomsky-why-republican-party-threat-human-survival>

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

So why would I vote for the international cheerleader of fracking, Hillary Clinton?

<http://www.motherjones.com/environment/2014/09/hillary-clinton-fracking-shale-state-department-chevron>

http://www.slate.com/blogs/the_slatest/2016/03/06/demdebate_bernie_sanders_crushes_hillary_clinton_on_fracking.html

<http://www.motherjones.com/environment/2015/04/hillary-clinton-climate-change-president>

In short, she is not an environmental candidate, Sanders is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 8th, 2016 at 11:06 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, varjayana and being a monk/ nun

Content:

qwerty13 said:

... in Dzogchen all you need is presence and awareness and ...

Kelwin said:

Yup. And to do that, it might be extremely useful to become a monk.

Malcolm wrote:

That depends very much on the person, the time and the place.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 8th, 2016 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, varjayana and being a monk/ nun

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

If there are no monks or nuns, there is no Sangha and no Dharma. It's not optional.

Je Tsongkhapa showed that if someone is serious about practising Vajrayana, it should be done so on the basis of taking pratimoksha vows which can be either the lay or ordained vows.

Malcolm wrote:

This is false, for example, the Buddha Sikhin never ordained monks or nuns.

Not only this, but each of the nine yānas is an independent means of liberation, self-contained and self-sufficient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 8th, 2016 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, varjayana and being a monk/ nun

Content:

qwerty13 said:

Maybe some people lack understanding of Vajrayana and based on that they become monks. But on the other hand Lama Tsongkhapa was a monk. He ordained at the age 21 and of course he must have had profound realizations in the meaning of tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

By age 21? I don't think so.

qwerty13 said:

Oh sorry, I was careless. Berzin says

(http://www.berzinarchives.com/web/en/archives/approaching_buddhism/teachers/lineage_masters/short_biography_lama_tsongkhapa.html)

Although some accounts say Tsongkhapa took full monk vows at age 21, it is uncertain in which year this actually took place. It was probably later in his 20s

Some sources say he took vows at the age 21. But more likely this happened later. So somewhere in he`s 20s. I just read the first part of he`s sentence when i was checking this information.

Malcolm wrote:

What I meant was is that I do not think that Tsongkhapa was profoundly realized in Vajrayāna in his twenties.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 8th, 2016 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Unknown said:

Groundbreaking research at Johns Hopkins University of Medicine has provided insight into the benefits of mediated doses of psilocyben, the active psychedelic compound found in "magic" mushrooms.

Malcolm wrote:

<https://www.minds.com/blog/view/552472993125638144>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 8th, 2016 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, varjayana and being a monk/ nun

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Usually people who become monks do so years before they have any real understanding of Dzogchen teachings. And when they do gain understanding of Dzogchen teachings, if they are a monk, what is the point of giving up their vows?

qwerty13 said:

Maybe some people lack understanding of Vajrayana and based on that they become monks. But on the other hand Lama Tsongkhapa was a monk. He ordained at the age 21 and of course he must have had profound realizations in the meaning of tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

By age 21? I don't think so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 8th, 2016 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: Authoritarianism, Splitting, and Buddhadharma

Content:

maybay said:

Its your parsimonious rhetorical strategy that intrigues me.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a strategy. I just don't like to waste words where they are not needed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 8th, 2016 at 4:02 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen, vajrayana and being a monk/ nun

Content:

qwerty13 said:

I used to think that being a monk is something very important and it would be best that vajrayana practitioners become monks and uphold more than 200 pratimoksha vows instead of being a lay person. I thought that when Buddha said that you can attain buddhahood as a lay person was just a provisional teaching and it was meant to guide those attached to lay life more gradually to the fact that best thing to do is to become a monk.

But today I understood that in Vajrayana and of course in Dzogchen all you need is presence and awareness and maintain your samaya and do daily sadhana practice and that is all you need for buddhahood. There really is no need to take many pratimoksha vows to limit activities of body (like sitting on luxurious chairs, dance and sing etc..).

But now question arises. In Nyingma, Sakya, Kagyu and Gelug schools we have monks. And they all practice HYT / inner tantrās.

So if daily sadhana practice, awareness and samaya is all you need in vajrayana and dzogchen, why should you become a monk? What is the advantage here?

Lama Zopa for example seems to praise the merits of becoming a monk. I used to think that way too. But having practiced under Namkhai Norbu and studied precious vase I no longer understand the advantage of being a monk.

You visualize yourself as the yidam just the same way as a monk tantrika as you would as a lay person.

You practice contemplation just the same way as a monk dzogchenpa as you would as a lay dzogchenpa.

The only difference is that the other one has monks vows to hold.

So what is the advantage of being a monk in one of the traditions of tibetan buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:

Usually people who become monks do so years before they have any real understanding of Dzogchen teachings. And when they do gain understanding of Dzogchen teachings, if they are a monk, what is the point of giving up their vows?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 8th, 2016 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Authoritarianism, Splitting, and Buddhadharma

Content:

Jeff H said:

I have to agree with maybay on this. America doesn't have a true democracy and in the expression, "the will of the people", our socio-political system is very adept at manipulating both the people's will and the people who vote. Power and authority arise largely from those manipulators.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends very much on what you mean by true democracy. Where I live, we have the town meeting system. You never saw a more pure expression of direct democracy anywhere. I agree, in other places in the US, it is less democratic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 8th, 2016 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: Authoritarianism, Splitting, and Buddhadharma

Content:

maybay said:

I had a boss once who never wanted to talk about values. He would get quite angry when I brought it up. He liked to talk about people. He was a simple person who liked to play the balance of power game.

Power is another thing from authority though. Surely power comes from "the people", since this is one thing and from solidarity comes power. No single value could hold people together. Values are truly a divisive topic. Without values though, a political system is impoverished, and it will rot.

Malcolm wrote:

You really need to read a Theory of Justice by Rawls, and then follow that with Anarchy, State and Utopia by Nozick. Then to top it all off, Social Ecology by Bookchin. Followed with Ecology of Wisdom by Naess.

Then you will understand Democracy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 7th, 2016 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: Critical Mass - The Hundredth Monkey

Content:

Saoshun said:

So we need to reconsider this or recalculate because Kali yuga always starts for anything old vs new and this cannot be considered as kali yuga but just wack excuse.

for example for communists kali yuga started with democracy, for monarchists kali yuga starts with communism etc.

I highly doubt we are kali yuga because in kali yuga everything should be very dark, bloodshed, no compassion or good people around etc. like really horrific things much worse than happen in regular wars.

Malcolm wrote:

No, The Kali yuga gets progressively worse as time goes on, it does not start as a shit show, that does not happen until we enter the age of weapons and famine, which we are on the brink of.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 7th, 2016 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Authoritarianism, Splitting, and Buddhadharma

Content:

maybay said:

The fact is that any government is constantly renegotiating who and what it governs over. When that changes quickly, the systems of accountability can have difficulty adapting. That's when you get things like a sub-prime mortgage crisis or an Arab spring.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/No_taxation_without_representation

People have no authority as such. It is the legal bureaucracy from which a democracy derives authority, rather than judgments based on traditional values, or a flow of charismatic edicts. A legal bureaucracy is considered authoritative in large part because it is rational.

Malcolm wrote:

No, in every instance in a democracy power comes from the people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 7th, 2016 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: Authoritarianism, Splitting, and Buddhadharma

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Democracy is a system of governance which derives its authority from the people.

Sherab Dorje said:

^^^zackly!^^^

maybay said:

It couldn't be more vague. If nothing is distinguished, what is really being said? What is meant by "the people"?

Malcolm wrote:

As in, We, The People of the United States...." etc., the people, the commoners, the subjects, དཔུངས་, the demos, etc.

Merriam-Webster

Full Definition of democracy

plural de·moc·ra·cies

1

a : government by the people; especially : rule of the majority

b : a government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation usually involving periodically held free elections

2

: a political unit that has a democratic government

3

capitalized : the principles and policies of the Democratic party in the United States
<from emancipation Republicanism to New Deal Democracy — C. M. Roberts>

4

: the common people especially when constituting the source of political authority

5

: the absence of hereditary or arbitrary class distinctions or privileges

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 7th, 2016 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Donatas said:

it's interesting to read all the comments about what happens and should I do it or not, but what was I aiming for here, is the buddhist perspective on that stuff. I mean, f.e. how would a buddhist monk see this? Is it considered ok or is it a thing that you shouldn't do this lifetime?

Malcolm wrote:

As unnecessary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, March 7th, 2016 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Farewell

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We'll meet again

Don't know where

Don't know when

But I know we'll meet again some sunny day

Keep smiling through

Just like you always do

'Till the blue skies drive the dark clouds far away

So will you please say hello

To the folks that I know

Tell them I won't be long

They'll be happy to know

That as you saw me go

I was singing this song

We'll meet again

Don't know where

Don't know when

But I know we'll meet again some sunny day

We'll meet again

Don't know where

Don't know when

But I know we'll meet again some sunny day

Keep smiling through

Just like you always do

'Til the blue skies

Drive the dark clouds far away

So will you please say hello

To the folks that I know

Tell them it won't be long

They'll be happy to know

That as you saw me go

I was singin' this song

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 6th, 2016 at 1:13 PM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The book, *Singing to the Plants*, by Steven Beyer and the accompanying website,

<http://www.singingtotheplants.com>, is an excellent, scholarly resource. The author of the book is also the author of the seminal "Cult of Tara." He is also the author of a very important book in Tibetan linguistics.

In this book he analysis the culture and dynamics of mestizo shamanism, various trends, etc. It is really quite excellent.

Vasana said:

Ideally you want way more than just 1 week of the diet. 2 weeks minimum but more if you can. It's tough and means adopting very bland and boring eating habits for a couple weeks but it's more than worth it. The cleaner your body is going in to it, the less physical discomfort you'll feel. There will still be some physical discomfort either way so you need to mentally prepare for that. Remove as much physical tension in your body before hand too.

Have in mind the specific areas of your life that you're looking to bring some healing and clarity too. Which emotions or afflictions bring the most harm to yourself and others in your life? Which conscious or subconscious thought patterns bring yourself and those you interactive with the most harm? Which ideas and behaviors do you hold on to that act against your highest spiritual-good and the highest spiritual-good of those in your life?

It's not been mentioned much in discussions on Dharma and psychedelics/plant-medicine , but if you sincerely combine the intention and aspiration of Bodhichitta to your journey/ceremony, then whatever happens, you'll know that your intention was at least sound.

In the long run, this is about more than just you as it can potentially change how you view the world and interact with others, but at the same time, it's also a very personal experience and opportunity to access parts of the psyche that are usually double or tippie veiled by symbol and imagery. Speak and ask constructive questions to the medicine and your own awareness to guide the journey forwards beneficial insights.

Integration of the experience afterwards is just as important as the experience it's self. Record the experience in words and potentially pictures while it's still fresh.

Ivo said:

All questions regarding Ayahuasca would be better directed to forums where you have knowledgeable people with vast experience on the topic and not to Buddhist boards where this is still considered controversial and is met with prejudice. Here you will get a lot of advice by people who have never done it and who have strong opinions against it based on belief systems alone. There you will find mature, tolerant and knowledgeable communities which have members who have done hundreds or even thousands of trips on Ayahuasca, DMT, Mushrooms etc. and who can offer real advice, encouragement and who will approach you on a friendly manner as a fellow human being and not judge

you from a fundamentalist religious viewpoint. They will share with you the real safety warnings in a supportive way. So, to the OP, I would highly recommend that you direct your questions to the following websites:

<https://dmt-nexus.me> - for Ayahuasca and DMT related discussions, although there is a good general section.

[some other links removed]

On these forums you will find all kind of folk, but there are members with 40+ years of experience in shamanism and entheogen use. You will be amazed at the quality of some discussions and the vastness of the information you can find.

[some other links removed]

Do yourself a favor, go there and spare yourself the indoctrination. Do your own research and form your own opinions responsibly. Have common sense and be safe. Finally, my personal advice would be for you to consider Ayahuasca for your first trip and to avoid MDMA for now, as it requires a different kind of knowledge and can cause more problems if improperly used, not to mention that it would be very difficult for you to know exactly what you are taking. If you decide to go on with this, stick to Santo Daime and follow their recommendations to the letter, as they have genuine lineage and knowledge about this, not to mention that you will be getting the real brew. Follow the regimen strictly.

{Moderator note: the Nexus forum is uncritically enthusiastic about Ayahuasca and other drugs to the point of irresponsibility. Its advice is therefore far less balanced than readers will find here on DW and should be approached with caution.}

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 6th, 2016 at 11:09 AM

Title: Re: Authoritarianism, Splitting, and Buddhadharma

Content:

maybay said:

The objective of authoritarianism is to consolidate power. The objective of democracy is to restrain power through institutions of accountability that preserve the power dynamic. Authoritarian leaders appeal to traditional forms of authority, democracies only to the present demographic.

Sherab Dorje said:

Hate to be the one to point it out to you, but in some parts of the world democracy is the traditional form of authority.

maybay said:

Democracy is a system of government not a form of authority.

Malcolm wrote:

Democracy is a system of governance which derives its authority from the people.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 6th, 2016 at 9:18 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Dundee said:

Politicians do lie.

Malcolm wrote:

Not Bernie.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 6th, 2016 at 9:18 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Dundee said:

The United States already kills innocent men, women, and children.

Malcolm wrote:

Not as a matter of policy.

Dundee said:

Obama did not change anything about that. I don't see much good about Trump but just like you think you will suffer as a super liberal it's the same under Hillary if somebody is a "super predator" as she put it and she won't be helping black families or stop mass incarceration if we look at her record.

Malcolm wrote:

I am a Bernieorbuster. I won't be voting for Clinton. Never have, never will. I don't vote for neoliberal, neoconservative warmongers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 6th, 2016 at 4:34 AM

Title: Re: Tibetan Traditional Medicine

Content:

RikudouSennin said:

How much can a person realistically learn about TTM from books and online courses and in person when possible to be able to be of practical use to oneself and others?

My younger brother is going through a lot of stress and I want to gain knowledge about TTM myself as I start researching people for treatment.

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to learn TTM from a doctor. It is the only way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 6th, 2016 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Trump is sexist, racist douchebag. He is also completely dishonest, lies stream out of his mouth at an astonishing rate. He is also a weakling and a coward.

Dundee said:

I understand that you have your opinion, but I don't agree with it. We are all entitled to our opinions in this country, and if we aren't then something will need to happen so that might be why people are voting for Donald Trump.

Malcolm wrote:

People who vote for Trump are idiots.

Dundee said:

Where I sit, honestly white liberals are afraid of him the most and yet white liberals prove to be racist again and again.

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, lets get something straight. I am not a liberal, I am much, much, worse than a liberal.

So you support his murderous plan to kill innocent women and children? Guess your commitment to Buddhadharma just flew out the window.

Dundee said:

So who is the coward is another difference of opinion and we will have to settle it in this country. I hope it is peaceful but we all know history, so we will have to wait and see.

Malcolm wrote:

Trump has no problem turning his thugs out to beat on black folks who come to his rallies. And when he went to Texas he would not go ten miles near the border because it was "not safe." Given that his father was arrested at a KKK riot, I am not surprised at all when Trumps followers resort to Nazi-style violence at his rallies. Plus — you gotta love this — he is going to cripple the first amendment so he can sue the papers and "make lots of money." What a pathetic excuse for a candidate. No wonder the Republicans are desperately trying to figure out how they can get him out of the race.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, March 6th, 2016 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Dundee said:

I really do like Donald Trump. He makes me laugh. I don't know if I would vote for him, but he would be as good as anyone else and maybe an improvement in many respects. Now we have come a long way in America to inspire the rest of the world to be better and wiser and to seek justice and compassion. This whole world has changed and we are never going to be the same. Sometimes, though, we have to really look back at what we lost on the road to improvement and get it back, and we need to get back to strong leadership and honesty. Trump is a man's man and America doesn't remember what that was like. I has been a very long time indeed and maybe not a moment too soon.

Malcolm wrote:

Trump is sexist, racist douchebag. He is also completely dishonest, lies stream out of his mouth at an astonishing rate. He is also a weakling and a coward.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 5th, 2016 at 12:17 PM

Title: Re: Critical Mass - The Hundredth Monkey

Content:

Queequeg said:

More seriously - can you elaborate on that?

Malcolm wrote:

The idea being that the deeper we move into the Kali Yuga, the more necessary the most essential teaching will be for sentient beings. During the Golden age, when food literally drops off of trees into our mouths, there is not much need for essential teachings since in general, everyone is pretty happy and content.

Saoshun said:

How did you calculate that? We are far from Kali Yuga, we are now moving into Dwapara not Kali Yuga

Malcolm wrote:

According to Buddhist sources we have been in the Kali Yuga for some time now.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 5th, 2016 at 12:14 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Wayfarer said:

The destruction of indigenous cultures would be one consequence of such views, but there are many others.

Malcolm wrote:

I was under the impression it came from racism...an old Western value, indeed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 5th, 2016 at 11:44 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Wayfarer said:

It has to do with the collapse of traditional values in Western culture.

Malcolm wrote:

Ahahahahahah, you mean the very ones that lead to the ongoing genocide of indigenous people around the globe?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, March 5th, 2016 at 8:17 AM

Title: Re: AYAHUASCA

Content:

Donatas said:

Hey. I have been recently invited to aya ceremony. Any thoughts on it? I saw a huge discussion about LSD, but what about aya? It's considered a sacred plant and it really takes you somewhere. as far as i've been told.

Malcolm wrote:

To do ayahuasca properly, you need to follow a special diet for many days, etc. It is not just "something" to do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 4th, 2016 at 10:20 PM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Simon E. said:

That is a specious comparison. Neither you nor anyone else has any way of demonstrating a link between the widespread use of an upaya even in a reduced form, and a reduction in the prospects of Enlightenment for large numbers of people. It is equally possible that that a reduced anapanasati provides a bridge to more firm ground. It is doubly specious to make a comparison between that reduced upaya and the use of neurotoxins ..and while we are at it lets lose the use of euphemisms like 'psychotropics' in this context..not least because Buddhadharma does not recognise a 'psyche' in the terms implied.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Simon:

LSD is not a neurotoxin, nor is Psilocybin, nor DMT.

Not endorsing their use as a Buddhist upaya (other than the narrow means identified by Garab Dorje), just clarifying the terms.

M

Simon E. said:

But they ARE so classed Malcolm. The active agent in Psilocybin for example is an alkaloid shown to directly affect neurotransmission by modifying the structure of serotonin.

You may advocate a reclassification of these substances. But medical science sees them as neurotoxins.

Malcolm wrote:

LSD has no known toxicity level. The toxicity level of Psilocybin is so low, you would have to take the amount of psilocybin found in 45 pounds of mushrooms in order to experience any toxic effect. DMT also has no known toxicity level. And if you ingest it raw, without a catalyst, it just passes through your digestive tract with no effect at all (which is why people smoke it or combine it with an MAO Inhibitor).

I suspect these things are defined as neurotoxins as a result of Gvt. policy rather than scientific definition. Alcohol is a neurotoxin of much greater strength than Psilocybin, and as I pointed out, LSD and DMT have no known toxicity levels. Even the putative toxicity of THC is a result of bathing neurons in pure THC for days at a time, hardly a real world application.

Anyway, we both agree such substances have virtually no application in Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 4th, 2016 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

I say "may" for two reasons: First Anapanasati falls under the category of Right concentration in the Noble Eightfold Path, I guess that would make it a source of wisdom accumulation. So while it is true that Anapanasati and LSD are both samsara, some things in samsara are considered wholesome and others (intoxication, something that goes against the 5th precept) are considered unwholesome.

Malcolm wrote:

Alcohol is permitted as medicine even for monks. Therefore, therapeutic uses of LSD, etc., are permissible, even for Buddhists in general. For example, if I have cancer, and I am experiencing nausea, I will definitely smoke weed without hesitation. Also Marijuana has many uses, especially for chronic pain. Everything is equally medicine and poison, it just depends on how it is used.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 4th, 2016 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Simon E. said:

That is a specious comparison. Neither you nor anyone else has any way of demonstrating a link between the widespread use of an upaya even in a reduced form, and a reduction in the prospects of Enlightenment for large numbers of people. It is equally possible that that a reduced anapanasati provides a bridge to more firm ground. It is doubly specious to make a comparison between that reduced upaya and the use of neurotoxins ..and while we are at it lets lose the use of euphemisms like 'psychotropics' in this context..not least because Buddhadharma does not recognise a 'psyche' in the terms implied.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Simon:

LSD is not a neurotoxin, nor is Psylocybin, nor DMT.

Not endorsing their use as a Buddhist upaya (other than the narrow means identified by Garab Dorje), just clarifying the terms.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 4th, 2016 at 9:20 PM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

This is very true, but you know what I am seeing on this thread?

It seems to me that those who report on the positive outcomes of drug use are being hailed, while those that mention the negative effects are being hounded.

Hmmmmmmmm... I wonder why?

Malcolm wrote:

In terms of acid, shrooms and dmt, the vast majority of the negative effects are caused by parents and authorities freaking out on kids who they find are tripping...

And where people seem to have problems with these drugs, it is usually a result of other, unworked out issues that they are having, not the drugs themselves per se.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 4th, 2016 at 8:42 PM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Ivo said:

I am talking only about 3 substances, out of these hundreds out there, most notably DMT and Psilocybin, the former of which is circulating in our blood right now as we are typing our replies. It is part of human metabolism and there is a lot of scientific evidence to suggest that it is responsible for dreaming, meditation states and even everyday alertness and attention. In effect, you are on a small dose of DMT as you are reading this. The current opinion is that it is produced by several glands, possibly the pineal, among others, and it is found right now in your blood, brain, liver, kidney, lungs. There are excellent research papers on this subject, notably by Dr. Rick Strassman but by other scientists as well, along with research on the somewhat similar compounds of Psilocybin and Psilocin, which, although not endogenous in humans, have similar psychoactive properties. And, which have been used by humans long before the appearance of Buddhism. These substances, including LSD, have well documented clinical uses for treatment of many stress and addiction related disorders, and active research is ongoing and actually gaining momentum.

On Psilocybin, please see the anthropologic research of Dr. Paul Stamets and also the current studies by the:

<https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT00302744?term=NCT00302744&rank=1>,

<http://www.nyucanceranxiety.org/>, <http://www.bpru.org/cancer-studies/>,

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17196053?dopt=AbstractPlus>,

<http://www.heffter.org/research-unm-alc.htm>, and, most notably, please see the Johns Hopkins Medical Center study on Psilocybin and Spirituality - PDF here -

http://www.hopkinsmedicine.org/Press_releases/2006/GriffithsPsilocybin.pdf

DMT is even more powerful than Psilocybin, it is endogenous to us and seems to have these same applications.

Please do your own research. I respect your opinion, but it is misinformed in this particular case.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, these kinds of drugs are great for therapy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 4th, 2016 at 8:37 PM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Ivo said:

Malcolm is giving a reference to the removal of the two obscurations...this is not really part of the language of Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 4th, 2016 at 8:36 PM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Ivo said:

The Great Perfection has its own specific language. In my opinion it is not good to mix it with the language of the paths which use other principles. At least, I do not like to do that. Some substances are suitable secondary means, not unlike postures and gazes. They can be very useful in very specific context. That's all I have been saying.

Malcolm wrote:

For therapy, and unlike postures and gazes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 4th, 2016 at 12:12 PM

Title: Re: Critical Mass - The Hundredth Monkey

Content:

Queequeg said:

The terminology I've been exposed to is primordial state not primordial knowledge.

Knowledge suggests something static, an object to be known. A degree of abstraction is irreducibly implied in 'knowledge.' The state, as ive found it described, suggests a dynamic experience, something that is irreducibly part of the subject.

Malcolm wrote:

The term "primordial state" is gloss for a few different Tibetan terms which all amount to the same concept, "the original basis."

The basis itself is in fact a pristine consciousness (ye shes, jñāna), completely untainted and immaculate. It is called the basis because it has not been realized. When it is realized, the basis is called "the result."

Queequeg said:

As I understand, guruyoga is not just some secret knowledge that we are made privy to, but rather a shared experience between teacher and pupil.

Malcolm wrote:

Direct introduction, specifically the mind transmission (which is based on the symbolic and oral transmission) is a state of knowledge about the basis shared between teacher and disciple. Guru yoga is a way of recapitulating that knowledge.

Queequeg said:

So, it still follows, what happens when half the people in a town are aware, and are at various stages of perfecting the state... Are people not going to pick up on it unless they've formally been introduced? And is it possible that a person surrounded by realized beings would not be perfumed by their proximity?

Malcolm wrote:

Unless they have some serious obscuration, it is likely they will become interested. But it also has to do with one's own merit. If one has much merit, than introducing people to the teachings is easy. If one has little merit, than it is hard.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 4th, 2016 at 11:55 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Ivo said:

Drugs like DMT do not produce anything on their own. They can remove constraints and depending on the merit, capacity and degree of development of the individual they can make it easier or more difficult to recognize the natural state. They can also make it easier to apply the methods of the path of transformation for someone who has this inclination and capacity. For someone tho is still perceiving phenomena as external in a stable way they can strengthen this division too. In my personal view these substances only remove a certain matrix of pathways which are connected to the physical body and

usually channel the mind in a particular way. They do not remove karmic imprints, they just allow the experience of a bardo-like state with more possibilities. Apart from that, very high doses of DMT and LSD certainly lead to total ego dissolution and rikpa glimpses. To what extent things stabilize again is completely individual and there seems to be a lot of degrees. But very few people actually take such high dosages. This is all what I have discovered myself and what I have been able to corroborate with some of my teachers so far.

Malcolm wrote:

At base, friend, liberation is the result of eliminating the afflictive obscuration, and omniscience is a result of eliminating the knowledge obscuration. There simply does not exist any drug which can enhance this process, no matter how large a dose you take or how long it is sustained.

Ivo said:

At base, there is nothing to be enhanced, produced or eliminated. I am not talking about any such kind of process. Going into Dorje Drollo destruction mode will not help in this case

Malcolm wrote:

If someone wishes liberation and omniscience, that is the only process that there is. There is no secret teaching by which one can bypass these two things, not even Dzogchen. If you are a sentient being, you have two obscurations; if you are buddha, you do not. We can discuss all kinds of things, differences between this path and that path, this method and that method, and so on, but they will never transcend the need to deal with these two factors. All 6.4 million ślokas of the Great Perfection, the inner tantras, outer tantras, the tripitika and so on all bear on these two points.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 4th, 2016 at 11:20 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Ivo said:

I watched the Reggie Ray video. What a nice person! However I do not agree with what he is saying, and for different reasons than Malcolm. For ordinary people with no meditation background and using recreational doses it may be true to an extent. However for a meditator this doesn't seem true. Also, to say that all psychedelic use never creates a bridge from the ordinary to the altered state is simply completely false.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as a drug that can produce a supramundane mind, free of obscurations. You can alter an afflicted mind as much as you want, and it will still be an afflicted mind. There is no drug that can produce the path of accumulation or application, much less the path of seeing.

Ivo said:

Drugs like DMT do not produce anything on their own. They can remove constraints and depending on the merit, capacity and degree of development of the individual they can make it easier or more difficult to recognize the natural state. They can also make it easier to apply the methods of the path of transformation for someone who has this inclination and capacity. For someone who is still perceiving phenomena as external in a stable way they can strengthen this division too. In my personal view these substances only remove a certain matrix of pathways which are connected to the physical body and usually channel the mind in a particular way. They do not remove karmic imprints, they just allow the experience of a bardo-like state with more possibilities. Apart from that, very high doses of DMT and LSD certainly lead to total ego dissolution and rika glimpses. To what extent things stabilize again is completely individual and there seems to be a lot of degrees. But very few people actually take such high dosages. This is all what I have discovered myself and what I have been able to corroborate with some of my teachers so far.

Malcolm wrote:

At base, friend, liberation is the result of eliminating the afflictive obscuration, and omniscience is a result of eliminating the knowledge obscuration. There simply does not exist any drug which can enhance this process, no matter how large a dose you take nor how long it is sustained.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 4th, 2016 at 10:27 AM

Title: Re: Entheogens and Bon

Content:

DGA said:

Back in the ill-starred LSD thread, I posed this question. It seems better to post it here, since it's Bon specific.

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=36&t=21412&start=200#p326690>

If the Indian Buddhists knew little of entheogens beyond datura, what about the Bonpos?

Malcolm wrote:

Even less.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 4th, 2016 at 10:03 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Ivo said:

I watched the Reggie Ray video. What a nice person! However I do not agree with what he is saying, and for different reasons than Malcolm. For ordinary people with no meditation background and using recreational doses it may be true to an extent. However for a meditator this doesn't seem true. Also, to say that all psychedelic use

never creates a bridge from the ordinary to the altered state is simply completely false.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as a drug that can produce a supramundane mind, free of obscurations. You can alter an afflicted mind as much as you want, and it will still be an afflicted mind. There is no drug that can produce the path of accumulation or application, much less the path of seeing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 4th, 2016 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: Critical Mass - The Hundredth Monkey

Content:

Queequeg said:

More seriously - can you elaborate on that?

Malcolm wrote:

The idea being that the deeper we move into the Kali Yuga, the more necessary the most essential teaching will be for sentient beings. During the Golden age, when food literally drops off of trees into our mouths, there is not much need for essential teachings since in general, everyone is pretty happy and content.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 4th, 2016 at 2:38 AM

Title: Re: Critical Mass - The Hundredth Monkey

Content:

Queequeg said:

Is there anything in Dzogchen teachings (or related teachings) suggesting there is a critical mass point where the primordial state would become normalized throughout a community?

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen teachings predict that it is the last teaching to spread widely among humans prior to the age of weapons, famines and epidemics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 4th, 2016 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

That does not make sense, because for a monk or nun there is no "proper orifice". The distinction was not made for monastics but for lay practitioners, no play on words intended.

Sherab Dorje said:

No, it doesn't make any sense, but the Vinaya is undeniably the monastic code. Maybe the original rule defined a specific orifice and had to be elucidated upon because monastics were taking advantage of it.

Malcolm wrote:

It is defined as the penetration of one's member in any part of a body— vagina, mouth, ass, ears, nose, etc— for the purpose of sexual gratification by more than one inch.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 4th, 2016 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

Really? Where? In all the traditions of the Vinaya?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Sherab Dorje said:

Really I thought it was a Tibetan cultural accretion.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. Please consult Abhidharmakośabhaṣyam, chapter four, etc.

You will not find any detailed discussion of this issue in suttas, though you will find discussion of this Mahāyāna sutras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, March 4th, 2016 at 2:09 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Reggie Ray was recently asked about psychedelics in one of his webcasts:

```
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 video should begin at the right point if you click the play button above, but if not the relevant portion begins around 1:06:00.

Malcolm wrote:

Sorry, Reggie, there is no transcendence through LSD, Ayahuasca or any thing else; and one thing they certainly do not do is propel you, even momentarily, beyond your traces/habitual tendencies. But they sure are good for dismantling pianos.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 3rd, 2016 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Ayu said:

(...)

"They where going wild completely", a spokesman of the hospital explained.

Imagine: Homeopaths and aroma therapists dismantling a waiting room.

Malcolm wrote:

Sounds fun. Some friends and I dismanteled a derelict piano under influence of Peyote once. We should have recorded it...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 3rd, 2016 at 6:30 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

skittles said:

I don't see why anyone would think Buddhists would have a particularly valid opinion about LSD.

It's a chemical that Buddhists historically don't have any experience in using or evaluating.

Malcolm wrote:

Speak for yourself, kiddo. Evaluated it, moved along.

Better things to with my time now, like argue with someone who has wrong on the internet...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, March 3rd, 2016 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Ivo said:

It is obvious that there was very little knowledge about entheogens during the early period of Buddhism in India...

Malcolm wrote:

I would go with this. Why? There is not virtually no mention of them in Ayurvedic Herbals as well, apart from datura.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 2nd, 2016 at 4:45 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Simon E. said:

Gulp...from this side of the Atlantic, President Trump looks likely...Any reassurances you chaps?

Malcolm wrote:

If so, we will be invading England next.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 2nd, 2016 at 11:21 AM

Title: Re: Authoritarian personality

Content:

maybay said:

And what if they hear the teachings and they aren't freed. Then what?

Malcolm wrote:

Then you keep supporting them until they are, and that, my friend, is the role of a real teacher. The rest is all bullshit.

maybay said:

What do you mean by support?

Malcolm wrote:

Continuing to try, with many methods, to introduce the student to their own state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 2nd, 2016 at 11:19 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I don't know, but she is definitely a <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/nri/us-canada-news/A-Hindu-wedding-for-a-US-lawmaker/articleshow/46884373.cms>.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. We live in a border land, so what to expect, though she represents more buddhists than anyone else.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, maybe she can be an honorary Bernisattva.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, maybe a worldly emanation of the Berniekāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 2nd, 2016 at 10:27 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Queequeg said:

I've been impressed with Tulsi Gabbard for a while now... This makes me like her even more.

There goes her prime time slot at the Convention.

Anyone know if she's named after Tulsi Das?

dzogchungpa said:

I don't know, but she is definitely a <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/nri/us-canada-news/A-Hindu-wedding-for-a-US-lawmaker/articleshow/46884373.cms>.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. We live in a border land, so what to expect, though she represents more buddhists than anyone else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 2nd, 2016 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: Authoritarian personality

Content:

maybay said:

And what if they hear the teachings and they aren't freed. Then what?

Malcolm wrote:

Then you keep supporting them until they are, and that, my friend, is the role of a real teacher. The rest is all bullshit.

Taco_Rice said:

This seems like an interesting tangent to pursue briefly, and it potentially relates somewhat to the subjects of both authoritarian personalities and Dharma in a general sense. Please expound, if you would good sir, on the authority of the teacher in your tradition, or even Buddhism in general, for our edification.

Malcolm wrote:

A teacher in my tradition is authoritative only in relation to their experience in the teachings. Of course, this can be difficult to negotiate, since anyone can say anything about their experience. But fundamentally, a teachers sole authority, in my tradition, is to assist their students' liberation. Beyond that, they have no authority.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 2nd, 2016 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: Authoritarian personality

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If someone hears the teachings and is thereby freed, that is sufficient.

maybay said:

And what if they hear the teachings and they aren't freed. Then what?

Malcolm wrote:

Then you keep supporting them until they are, and that, my friend, is the role of a real teacher. The rest is all bullshit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 2nd, 2016 at 4:24 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Astus, they are dharmas, the four unconditioned dharmas.

Astus said:

There are other nominal dharmas as well, like speed (java), number (samkhya), and syllables (vyanjanakaya).

Malcolm wrote:

That is entirely besides the point. These three are included in the dharmāyatana, along with the mental factors because they are solely objects of the mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 2nd, 2016 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So space, emptiness and the two cessations are not dharmas? Really?

Astus said:

As <http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?p=326065#p326065>: "All four denominate types of absences, and as such they are not different from common concepts like the blankness of a screen."

Malcolm wrote:

Astus, they are dharmas, the four unconditioned dharmas.

I really question whether you actually understand these basic terms at all when you spout nonsense like dharmakāya = dependent origination. The more we converse about this issue, the more confused you seem.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 2nd, 2016 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Virgo said:

Whether you see them or not, those physical phenomena are still there.

Astus said:

If it is not experienced, it is not a phenomenon, as it does not occur to us.

Malcolm wrote:

So space, emptiness and the two cessations are not dharmas? Really?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 2nd, 2016 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

How do you account for nonconceptual perception in your scheme? You can't. Since you can't, you are, *prima facie*, denying there is such a thing as a direct perception. Direct perceptions, for example, the direct perception of a blue vase, are nonconceptual by definition. [/quote]

All experiences of the five physical categories are nonconceptual, as you say, as thoughts are attributed to them subsequently. The difference is that by direct perception you seem to mean an interaction between subject and object, while I say that it is an appearance. However, even in the 18 elements scheme the perception happens only once contact is made and a sensory consciousness occurred, that is, an experience. So in the end there is no difference between the two.

Astus said:

Astus, now you are contradicting yourself:

...a form exists either as a concept produced by the bifurcation of experience to subject

and object, or as a subsequent concept about the object.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 2nd, 2016 at 1:43 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A thing must be visible, a priori, in order to be seen.

Astus said:

Visibility is a quality attributed after it is seen to the concept of the object. That is, a form exists either as a concept produced by the bifurcation of experience to subject and object, or as a subsequent concept about the object.

Malcolm wrote:

How do you account for nonconceptual perception in your scheme? You can't. Since you can't, you are, prima facie, denying there is such a thing as a direct perception. Direct perceptions, for example, the direct perception of a blue vase, are nonconceptual by definition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 2nd, 2016 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Astus said:

A bodhisattva should not have the concept of sentient beings anyway.

Sherab Dorje said:

This statement is figurative, not literal.

Malcolm wrote:

And it applies only to equipoise, not post-equipoise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, March 2nd, 2016 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Queequeg said:

The email scandal is probably worse than Clinton will admit. Less significant than the avowed critics will admit.

It probably is a crime, but more than having legal significance, it gives us a view of the Clinton camp's internal thinking.

Manjushri Fan said:

I agree with you on this, the email scandal needs sorted before the elections and the final nominations

No offense, but if you're not American or immersed in our political news, you really have no chance of understanding what's happening here now. This election is a radical departure from anything before. There is a revolution afoot.

I wouldn't take offense at this, I have tried to understand them but it's such a different culture I think I'm going to stop bothering

Malcolm wrote:

What you are observing is the meltdown of the 2 party system in the US. This is a good thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 1st, 2016 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But no, this is not the case, the five sense objects exist independently of the body as objects for the five senses, conventionally speaking.

Astus said:

There is no disagreement on the conventional concept of independent external objects. But the form is not something that only exists when it is seen.

What makes a form form? That it is seen. What is it when not seen?

"What is the characteristic of the form element? The form element is that which becomes visible when it is seen by the eye, and over which is exercised the supremacy of the eye element. The characteristics of the elements of sound, odor, taste, tangibility and the mental object are like that of the form element."

(Abhidharmasamuccaya, p 4)

Let's take an apple as an example. We can agree that conventionally an apple does not come from any of the faculties, but it's grown on a tree whence it reaches our kitchen table in a complicated way, and during that time there is the apple travelling from there to here. Once we have that apple, it can be sensed by all five physical faculties. When we look at it, we see the form of the apple. Is that form what's come from the orchard to the kitchen? Is that form even the apple? The answer to both are now, because even by abhidharma terms the apple is conventional, and dharmas, like form, are momentary. So, it seems to me that form is only what and when it is seen.

Malcolm wrote:

What a strange interpretation you have. All the Samuccaya is saying is that a form becomes visible to oneself when it is seen by the eye. What is a form? Visible matter, i.e., form is color and shape, and also there are 20 secondary forms. Seeing something does

not grant it visibility, as you suggest. Things are visible (or not) to our eyes due to the condition of light, dark, obstruction and so on. A thing must be visible, a priori, in order to be seen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 1st, 2016 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The point, Matt, is that Astus, in attempting to defend his thesis dharmakāya = dependent origination, has concocted a theory of perception which is incoherent.

BTW, Candrakīrti affirms that there cannot be sight in absence of a form, an eye and an eye consciousness. This does not mean he takes them to be real.

M

Matt J said:

This sounds like naive realism, which has largely been debunked. What is a sound, conventionally? The vibration of particles in a medium, most commonly, air particles. So what is present is the vibration, not the sound. The sound is created once the vibration interacts with a specific organ --- such as the ear drum. The ear drum vibrates, sending electrical signals to the brain, which then creates a sound. If there are no ear drums, the being won't hear a sound. If they have a sensitive body, they may feel the vibration. Not only that, but sound waves are one of a nearly infinite variety of waves and radiation, much of which is not picked up by our five senses.

From a Buddhist POV, Mipham argues that the appearance is a result, in large part, of the karmic traces and obscurations of the being perceiving them. In the Beacon of Certainty, Mipham points out

On the basis of outer and inner conditions,
One does not see the thing itself as it is,
But in the manner of seeing horses and cattle
In the place of wood blessed by illusion mantras.
(trans. John Petit)

Malcolm wrote:

But no, this is not the case, the five sense objects exist independently of the body as objects for the five senses, conventionally speaking.

There can be no sight unless there is an eye, an eye consciousness, and an object of the eye (form) that come together. But the form is not something that only exists when it is

seen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 1st, 2016 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Authoritarian personality

Content:

maybay said:

Of course you do...

Malcolm wrote:

Are you saying that I want our disciples to be "unswervingly devoted."?

If so, you are mistaken.

maybay said:

When some people hear of devotion all they can think of is obedience. Its quite tragic.

Malcolm wrote:

Your mileage may vary, but my guru, Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, insists that the purpose of a guru is to free their students. If someone hears the teachings and is thereby freed, that is sufficient. If there is anyone who should be devoted, it is the teacher to the student, rather than the other way around.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 1st, 2016 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The five sense objects, one half of the material aggregate.

Astus said:

And those objects exist when they are sensed, that is, they exist in the continuum of experiences. So, while nominally they are external, it does not mean they are somewhere out there.

Malcolm wrote:

So before they are sensed, they do not exist? So in effect you are arguing that sensation produces the objects of the senses while they are being sensed.

For you, the scent of the incense does not exist until it is smelled.

But no, this is not the case, the five sense objects exist independently of the body as objects for the five senses, conventionally speaking.

There can be no sight unless there is an eye, an eye consciousness, and an object of the

eye (form) that come together. But the form is not something that only exists when it is seen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 1st, 2016 at 10:47 AM

Title: Re: Authoritarian personality

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. We want out chela to be completely free and awake.

maybay said:

Of course you do...

Malcolm wrote:

Are you saying that I want our disciples to be "unswervingly devoted."?

If so, you are mistaken.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 1st, 2016 at 7:10 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Astus said:

What is external in the five aggregates?

Malcolm wrote:

The five sense objects, one half of the material aggregate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 1st, 2016 at 3:17 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

eminent domain

Queequeg said:

Trump has no problem with eminent domain... something I suspect a lot of his supporters might have a problem with... but Trump can just pivot and start with, "We're going to start winning again. We're going to win so yuuuge. So yuge. You won't even believe it. Believe me." [Crowd drowns out the rest with "U.S.A.!" chant.]

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I know Trump has no problem with this. His followers are really crazy, though.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 1st, 2016 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So there is no sound which is not an experience? And what is thinking about that sound? Then "we have ideas?" etc.

Astus said:

Have you encountered any sound that you have not heard? I haven't. Thinking of a sound is another matter, and one can mentally listen to whole symphonies, but that's a function of imagination (can't think of a better word now).

Malcolm wrote:

So unless you hear it, a sound is not a sound? Unless you see it, a tree is not there?

Astus said:

As far as I can tell, I was simply giving a description of a kind of epistemological phenomenology, i.e. appearances as experience, in line with the teaching that the scope of Buddhism is within the boundaries of the five aggregates and six sensory areas.

Malcolm wrote:

The five aggregates, 12 sense gates and 18 elements all include external and internal phenomena.

Astus said:

But either I'm doing a really bad job at expressing myself

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed.

Astus said:

That chain of conditioned appearances is conventional, and depends on conventional dualities to function. To bring it back around — dharmakāya is unconditioned, and so it can never be a conditioned chain of appearances.

If you set up that separation, as unconditioned it does not have any function nor any relation, and that makes it as inert as space.

Malcolm wrote:

Dharmakāya can never be a conditioned chain of appearances. But I suggest you go and

review the Samdhinirmocana Sūtra and the dialogue where it is explained how dharmin and dharmatā are neither the same nor different. Your assertion that dharmakāya = dependent origination is not only wrong, but it also violates this principle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 1st, 2016 at 1:27 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Astus said:

I see, so for you one mind appears to another mind, unrelated?

An experience is already what is later conceptually separated to subject and object, viewer and viewed, but there is actually no need to establish various minds or even one mind. For example, there is a sound, that's an experience, an appearance. The sound is then followed by thoughts identifying the sound. Again, thoughts are experiences, caused by the sound. Then we have an idea of what kind of sound we heard, and further thoughts (feelings, intentions, etc.) come based on that idea. Like when the sound is identified as the doorbell and then we are happy because somebody we were expecting has arrived. That is a chain of conditioned appearances.

Malcolm wrote:

So there is no sound which is not an experience? And what is thinking about that sound? Then "we have ideas?" etc. Seriously? Are you drunk?

Astus said:

That is a chain of conditioned appearances

Malcolm wrote:

That chain of conditioned appearances is conventional, and depends on conventional dualities to function. To bring it back around — dharmakāya is unconditioned, and so it can never be a conditioned chain of appearances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, March 1st, 2016 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Queequeg said:

Trump gets a pass because he is the only one directly addressing the issue with the kind of simplistic solution that naively makes the most sense. (I don't think the reality of this policy has been thought through by Trump's supporters - the expense of building a wall,

Malcolm wrote:

The wall thing is really hilarious. It's been law (to build one) since 2006. But can't be built in the Rio Grand Flood plain, vast stretches of Arizona make it impossible, not to

mention the acreage that US Gvt. is tied up in court, trying to seize eminent domain of.

Queequeg said:

Meet and Greet with foreign dignitaries. Appoints judges and bureaucrats. Make policy speeches. Has some military power, but can only go so far without congress's support (which makes Hilary's support for the Iraq War a serious question about her judgment) Maybe the most important thing is to propose a budget that embodies the policies in the speeches.

Malcolm wrote:

If you have been watching Bernie, you know that this is not how he will run his presidency.

Queequeg said:

Bernie is the only real alternative to the showman - he speaks and acts from conviction... the only question is then, does he have enough people who share his vision and are not too cynical to throw their vote to Hilary simply because they can't be sure that he has a chance in a general election.

Malcolm wrote:

After today's, "We came, we saw, he died," I hope people will have the decency not to vote for Clinton.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is the "whatever" that is under scrutiny here. You claim experiences are the mind, and at the same time, deny they are the mind.

Astus said:

It all depends on what you mean by mind. Here I used it simply as another term for experiences in general.

Malcolm wrote:

But according to you, there is nothing experiencing experiences. In this case then, experiences are impossible.

Astus said:

In order for there to be dependently originated appearances, there must be conditions. Conditions are between appearances, i.e. appearances are conditioned by appearances.

Malcolm wrote:

So, there can't be any invisible conditions?

Astus said:

actually what you have said is that appearances are the experiences themselves. This can only be the case if the mind is its own appearances, appearing to itself, independently of any other cause or condition.

Again, what do you call mind? You seem to use it as if it were a single entity ("appearing to itself"), and that I do not do.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

I see, so for you one mind appears to another mind, unrelated?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Sherab Dorje said:

So there are phenomena existing outside of mind that are apprehended via the sense organs (given the existence of certain conditions like light, space, etc...) and then defined by the mind(s). It's the classic abhidharma/abhidhamma approach.

Astus said:

Appearances are what is experienced. While we may assume external phenomena, it does not change that all we have are perceptions, but it splits (categorises) the experiences to internal (subjective) and external (objective).

Malcolm wrote:

No, actually what you have said is that appearances are the experiences themselves. This can only be the case if the mind is its own appearances, appearing to itself, independently of any other cause or condition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 9:28 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And we set them up from what cause? How does this setting up even happen? How can there be relations if there are no entities apart from the mind?

Astus said:

Whatever we perceive are what we experience. To imagine something behind/beyond what is experienced is only conjecture and irrelevant. At the same time, attributing independence to perceptions, separate existence from experience, is how substantiality is established and suffering ensues.

Malcolm wrote:

It is the "whatever" that is under scrutiny here. You claim experiences are the mind, and at the same time, deny they are the mind.

In absence of external objects, at least Yogacara posits that appearances of subject and object arise from activated traces (vasana). You however fail to even give that much of an account. You cannot even explain the dependent origination of appearances, much less how it is that dependent origination = dharmakāya. In order for there to be dependently originated appearances, there must be conditions. But your experiences/mind just does not account for conditions at all. Your theory is incoherent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 6:05 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

muni said:

Freedom from I and its' biased perception = no form, no feeling, no perception, no impulses... Then no eyes, no nose, no ears, no body, no tongue, no mind...no object of mind = no grasping-no clinging. Not conditioned.

Then seeing, hearing, smelling.....I-less no clinging.

Suffer and harm due to the sense or apprehended belief in "I -thought" = sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Bases on this plant clearly qualify, since they defend themselves...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 10:57 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Trees exhibit both discrimination and knowledge hence, they have minds, as do other plants.

undefineable said:

To show this, the patterns of electrical signals in trees would have to bear some relation to the pattern of electrical signals in human brains while those humans are engaged in tasks involved in discrimination and knowledge.

Until [or unless this is!] that time, who knows?

Malcolm wrote:

That Rubicon has already been crossed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 10:56 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

One problem with sentient beings perhaps (at least the human kind) is that they are so sentient that they spend their days and days arguing about what is a "sentient being" ...

On the other hand, plants (whether sentient or not) do not spend their time arguing about what are "plants." Perhaps because they know just who they are, or are just what they are. They simply grow toward the sun in Spring.

Malcolm wrote:

Really, Jundo, thats all they do?

jundo cohen said:

Even if that is "all they do", that is certainly enough. Growing, flowering, returning to the earth, then to repeat in the Spring. Perhaps all that is more productive than such a discussion!

If you want to know if they ponder doing any more, you had better ask the plants.

Gassho, J

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, Jundo, such a reductionist view...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 10:38 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

seeker242 said:

Kinda like if you don't want to acknowledge equivocation taking place, just deny it!

Malcolm wrote:

When it concerns plant intelligence, there are just whole areas that you refuse to accept just because it does not correspond with your preconceptions.

seeker242 said:

Agreed! I refuse to accept it's possible to say a tree has a mind, without first redefining what the word "mind" means.

Malcolm wrote:

Mind mean mind, there is no reason to redefine it. Minds are discriminating and knowing. Trees exhibit both discrimination and knowledge hence, they have minds, as do other plants.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 9:57 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

One problem with sentient beings perhaps (at least the human kind) is that they are so sentient that they spend their days and days arguing about what is a "sentient being" ...

On the other hand, plants (whether sentient or not) do not spend their time arguing about what are "plants." Perhaps because they know just who they are, or are just what they are. They simply grow toward the sun in Spring.

Malcolm wrote:

Really, Jundo, thats all they do?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 9:56 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Right, you and the climate change denial people. If you dont like the science, just deny it.

seeker242 said:

Kinda like if you don't want to acknowledge equivocation taking place, just deny it!

Malcolm wrote:

When it concerns plant intelligence, there are just whole areas that you refuse to accept just because it does not correspond with your preconceptions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 9:16 AM

Title: Re: Hello, bright people

Content:

Donatas said:

Hello everyone. My name is Donatas and I am really new in Buddhism. First thing that grabbed my attention to it really hard was "The Tibetan Book of the Dead". Since then I'm studying that book as much as I can and together with that I try to learn about Buddhism as much as possible. Hopefully this forum will boost the speed of learning!

Malcolm wrote:

If you want to understand this book you need the empowerment, instructions and so on, more importantly, a qualified guru.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 9:07 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

daelm said:

Fella, those have been the definitions of the English words for centuries. What the Sanskrit has been applied to or not applied to is irrelevant to the research community under discussion. Take that up with (a) the people who translated into the English terms, and the (b) the community if use who applied the Sanskrit to whatever is has been applied to.

The facts are fairly straight forward. They're not dependent on whether you like them. The research into plant sentience indicates plant sentience. There is evidence for further research. And there are questions about what kind of evidence would be conclusive. That's the state of things.

If you were the person in the parent thread bitching that plant sentience had no science our reason behind, you should now be thoroughly aware that it does, and what that is. Next time just say "oh, I never knew that."

The fact that this places you on conflict with your preferred beliefs is not the research community's problem. It's yours. They're are many ways you can try deal with it, but the weakest and shabbiest is to refuse to acknowledge their work and cast aspersions on definitions that make you uncomfortable. If you don't want to engage with the actual material and the debate, that's great. You are not required to. Many people bow out. No issue with that.

d

seeker242 said:

I'm sorry, I do not consider the redefining of terms to be reasonable, not in the slightest. It's not reasonable to redefine terms in order to fit the research goals. That's just poor science. I'm quite aware that there is "science" behind it. I don't not agree that it's reasonable science...not in the slightest.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, you and the climate change denial people. If you dont like the science, just deny it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 6:52 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In general, you have asserted that all objects are merely projections of the mind itself.

Astus said:

In the sense that it is through categorisation that we set up things and relations between them.

Malcolm wrote:

And we set them up from what cause? How does this setting up even happen? How can there be relations if there are no entities apart from the mind?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This does not solve anything, since you have effectively ruled out all causation for the mind, you are effectively left with an inherent causeless mind, which is also insentient since there is no objects which it can cognize.

Astus said:

I don't see how, unless you mean a cause for the mind-stream that is something else than mind.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, you have asserted that all objects are merely projections of the mind itself. But there is no way these projections of the mind can be projected, there is also no basis for their impression. Since you have rejected subject and object even conventionally, you cannot account for cognition at all, and so therefore, your emptiness/mind is just a blank absence with no awareness at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 5:12 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

experiences supported on what? Are those experiences the same as or different than the subject experiencing them?

Astus said:

Experiences are streams of phenomena on what we project subject and object. It is like paratantra of the three svabhavas.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not solve anything, since you have effectively ruled out all causation for the mind, you are effectively left with an inherent causeless mind, which is also insentient since there is no objects which it can cognize.

At best, you have wound up with the passive purusha of Saṃkhya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 4:39 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Doesn't make them not Buddhist, just means they are ignorant in this instance, hopefully not willfully ignorant, but sometimes I wonder.

Malcolm wrote:

It makes them someone who associates with evil friends, which destroys their refuge. Hence, they can no longer be considered followers of the Buddha's Dharma until they see the faults in the object with whom they are associating, and regret their association utterly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so you are proposing a nondependent consciousness then, since experiences are just mind, are indivisible from the mind, and are therefore, caused by the mind itself, without reference to any other cause or condition. You just argued yourself into the Vedanta corner.

Not even yogacara abandons external objects conventionally.

Astus said:

That would apply if I talked of a single mind. What I said, however, is that dependent appearances - all dharmas - occur as experiences.

Malcolm wrote:

experiences supported on what? Are those experiences the same as or different than

the subject experiencing them?

And what the three dharma that be construed of as experiences, or even as appearances, at all?, space and the two cessations; four if you add emptiness to the those three.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Lukeinaz said:

Is it possible to be a practitioner of the buddhadharma while at the same time supporting Trump?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: Authoritarian personality

Content:

maybay said:

Interested or cynical? It makes perfect sense to me why people would want this. Isn't it what we want in a guru-chela relationship? Total unswerving devotion.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope. We want out chela to be completely free and awake. Not unswervingly devoted. Chelas are not dogs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So appearances are outside the mind?

Astus said:

No. There is just mind/experiences. From what did you conclude that?

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so you are proposing a nondependent consciousness then, since experiences are just mind, are indivisible from the mind, and are therefore, caused by the mind itself, without reference to any other cause or condition. You just argued yourself into the Vedanta corner.

Not even yogacara abandons external objects conventionally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://thefederalist.com/2015/07/28/how-close-was-donald-trump-to-the-mob/>

Being a loudmouth bigot, the Archie Bunker of 2016 who says what people are too afraid to say, is working well for Donald Trump. But it's time to hold his feet to the fire. This is a man who did a significant amount of business with mass murderers whose plunder of public and private funds added up to billions. What did he know about them? Maybe more importantly, what do they know about him?

We need to welcome Donald Trump to his new place in serious national politics with a cold, hard look at the crooks, conspirators, and criminals who peopled his early career. Either the Donald will attempt to weather such scrutiny, or he will disappear from the race under it. Either way, that scrutiny needs to start now.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Trump uses illegal laborers:

<http://www.nytimes.com/1991/04/27/nyregion/judge-says-trump-tower-builders-cheated-union-on-pension-funds.html>

They were Polish immigrants who suffered low wages and long hours, lived on junk food and sometimes slept at the work site -- all in the interest of meeting the deadline to build Trump Tower, the gilded centerpiece of Donald Trump's real-estate empire, which has all but disintegrated in recent months.

But now, after years of legal wrangling, the empire must pay.

In a ruling released on Thursday, a Federal judge found that Mr. Trump, a group of his associates and a union official conspired to avoid paying pension and welfare-fund contributions by hiring the immigrants to demolish the old Bonwit Teller building on East 57th Street at Fifth Avenue to make way for Trump Tower.

The ruling, by Judge Charles E. Stewart Jr. of the Southern District, found, in the behavior of the various defendants, "a conspiracy to deprive the funds of their rightful contribution."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What is the difference between space and mind?

You are missing this point.

Astus said:

There is no space outside the mind, so I do not propose some inanimate thing.

Appearances are experiences - i.e. the five aggregates (PP8000 12.2), the six sensory areas (SN 35.23). In other words, the emptiness-awareness of the mind is emptiness-interdependence, where awareness is consciousness of appearances (not an independent awareness without phenomena). Using basic terminology, no-self is that there is no self in the aggregates, it is a description of the aggregates, and not an entity called no-self.

Malcolm wrote:

So appearances are outside the mind?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 29th, 2016 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dharmakāya is a result of seeing the nature [dharmatā] of those things, it is the subject.

Astus said:

True, it is a term used for the nature of buddhas. Still, their nature is not different from the nature of appearances. How could they be separated, since beings themselves are appearances?

Malcolm wrote:

What is the difference between space and mind?

You are missing this point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 28th, 2016 at 11:46 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Trump on KKK:

<http://mediamatters.org/video/2016/02/28/cnns-jake-tapper-presses-donald-trump-to-condem/208862>

JAKE TAPPER (HOST): I want to ask you about the Anti-Defamation League, which this week called on you to publicly condemn unequivocally the racism of former KKK Grand Wizard David Duke, who recently said that voting against you at this point would be treason to your heritage. Will you unequivocally condemn David Duke and say that you don't want his vote or that of other white supremacists in this election?

DONALD TRUMP: Well just so you understand, I don't know anything about David Duke, OK? I don't know anything about what you're even talking about with white supremacy or white supremacists. So, I don't know. I don't know, did he endorse me, or what's going on? Because, you know, I know nothing about David Duke. I know nothing about white supremacists. And so you're asking me a question that I'm supposed to be talking about people that I know nothing about.

TAPPER: But I guess the question from the Anti-Defamation League is even if you don't know about their endorsement there are these groups and individuals endorsing you, would you just say unequivocally you condemn them and you don't want their support?

TRUMP: Well I have to look at the group. I don't know what group you are talking about, you wouldn't want me to condemn a group that I know nothing about; I'd have to look. If you would send me a list of the groups, I will do research on them and certainly I would disavow if I thought there was something wrong, but --

TAPPER: The Ku Klux Klan?

TRUMP: -- you may have groups in there that are totally fine and it would be very unfair. So give me a list of the groups, and I'll let you know.

TAPPER: OK, I mean I'm just talking about David Duke and the Ku Klux Klan here, but --

TRUMP: I don't know any -- honestly I don't know David Duke. I don't believe I've ever met him. I'm pretty sure I didn't meet him, and I just don't know anything about him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 28th, 2016 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="Mother's Lap"]It's a designation for the realisation of an enlightened being, which cannot be pointed at as a 'thing', correct? If the realisation could be pointed to as a 'thing' or object, it would lead to the fault of taking the dharmakaya as something 'out there' as you pointed out above.[/quote]

Well, it can be considered a dharma, but not a thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 28th, 2016 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Mother's Lap said:

The dharmakaya emanates the rupakayas in order to operate within the conditioned, but how does the unconditioned fundamentally manifest/interact/operate with the conditioned, i.e. jump the un/conditioned barrier?

Malcolm wrote:

The rūpakāyas are emanated as a result of realizing dharmatā; the dharmakāya is just the the total realization of the unfabricated nature of the mind — it is not like there is some dharmakāya out there, issuing forth avatars like Vishnu.

Mother's Lap said:

Right, so the appellation of 'unconditioned' is little more than prapranca (as the Madhyamakalamkara demonstrates the three unconditioned dharmas to be)?

And to bring it back around, do Nyingmapas and Sakyapas believe that enlightened beings can emanate unenlightened beings?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not merely prapañca, it is a conventionally important distinction. Confuse conditioned and unconditioned and you confuse basis, path and result.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 28th, 2016 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If Trump by some insane karma gets the Presidency, we can expect to see much more of this:

Muslim-American men shot dead in Indiana

<http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2016/02/muslim-american-men-murders-barely-ripple-160228003914813.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 28th, 2016 at 10:44 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

seeker242 said:

Yes, this is why they are redefining the term sentience as well. The "definitional heavy lifting" as you call it, is what I would call "equivocation".

Definition of cognition in English:

noun

[mass noun]

1The mental action or process of acquiring knowledge and understanding through thought, experience, and the senses.

<http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/cognition>

Cognition has always been considered a mental action. And of course, a mental action, by definition, requires a mind. Therefore, cognition requires a mind. Since trees do not have a mind cognition for a tree is impossible. Unless of course you were to redefine what a mind is. But if you do that, that's just more equivocation. If one says cognition does not require a mind, then you are changing it from "a mental action" to something else. AKA a redefining of the terms.

simon's point, above, makes this evident.

The point above only appears to make this evident by leaving out important information. Which is the fact that the sanskrit Saṃjñā has never been traditionally attributed to life forms in Kingdom Plantae.

Malcolm wrote:

If, as you do, argue, from first the dogmatic first principle that trees do not have minds (which is simply a bald assertion), then of course they will not have cognitions.

What is presently being contested the the idea that trees and plants in general do not have minds. When we speak of plant intelligence, we do not mean something without a mind, like AI.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 28th, 2016 at 10:41 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Mother's Lap said:

The dharmakaya emanates the rupakayas in order to operate within the conditioned, but how does the unconditioned fundamentally manifest/interact/operate with the conditioned, i.e. jump the un/conditioned barrier?

Malcolm wrote:

The rūpakāyas are emanated as a result of realizing dharmatā; the dharmakāya is just the the total realization of the unfabricated nature of the mind — it is not like there is some dharmakāya out there, issuing forth avatars like Vishnu.

Veering a little off topic here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 28th, 2016 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

dmr82 said:

Trump has already won. It's obvious. He knows it and it's dawning upon most of you by now. He's just going through the motions for show.

The thing is most of the haters are people locked up in their mental prisons and suffering from comfortable inertia who are absolutely shocked at the display of power they are witnessing. Here is someone standing before the whole world and fearlessly speaks his heart. It makes you realize maybe you've been wasting your life in distraction and entertainments when you could have been accomplishing things both in your spiritual practice and in the quality of your life. You can't accept this so your regret turns to full hate which you project onto Trump who is simply tired of seeing America being ripped off and being lead by incompetent quasi wannabe leaders. For the rest of us and the majority of America we welcome Trump as the new leader in a world of fake political correctness and special interest.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't hate Trump, I just recognize him for what he is, a racist, elitist demagogue, just one more one percentor trying to screw the American people.

The Republicans are already preparing to broker the Republican convention.

As far as rip offs go, Trump has ripped off the American people for billions already in (4) failed businesses and is being sued for fraud over Trump University by the AG of New York.

I know you have a resistance to facts, dmr82, but I will feel a bit sad for you when this is all over.

And there is no majority in America for Trump. At best he pulls down 35 percent of the Republican vote, mostly uneducated White male, and Romney showed in the last election, White votes do not win the Presidency any more.

If Trump does manage to be elected by some insane twist of fate, this country will be fracked, it may never recover intact.

#FeeltheBern

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 28th, 2016 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You defined dharmakāya as dependent origination. This is a clear error.

Astus said:

Why is that? Is there perhaps an emptiness outside of appearances? Or is it some inherent knowing maybe that makes it independent? Please elaborate.

Malcolm wrote:

Dependent origination does not exist apart from things, with things there is no dependent origination.

Dharmakāya is a result of seeing the nature [dharmatā] of those things, it is the subject.

As the Buddha said:

The buddhas see dharmatā,
the guides are dharmakāya;
the latter cannot be known without
without knowing dharmatā.

Further, the dharmakāya is defined as unconditioned, as the Vimalakīrti Sūtra states:

The kāya of the tathagata is unconditioned.

Now, on the other hand, dependent origination is clearly defined as conditioned, as the Ārya-karuṇāpūṇḍarīka-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra

All phenomena that are called "dependently originated" are understood to be seen as conditioned.

Thus, if you call dependent origination "dharmakāya," you are making a fundamental error in judgement which leads to dharmakāya being impermanent, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 28th, 2016 at 9:29 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

dmr82 said:

The people who love America love Trump. Those who hate America are the ones accusing Trump of being this or that as they can't disprove anything he says because its the truth plain and simple.

Malcolm wrote:

Every word out of Trump's mouth is either a huge exaggeration or an outright lie. He places very little value on the truth. He is a spectacle to be sure, but a spectacle that only fools can admire. He is the very epitome of the !%, who are a plague on this earth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 28th, 2016 at 3:30 PM

Title: Re: Vain enough to give, not generous enough to receive

Content:

maybay said:

Question is, why do we wait until we're dead to be generous?

Malcolm wrote:

Taxes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 28th, 2016 at 3:08 PM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

mirrormind said:

In which text(s) does Garab Dorje talk about hallucinogens as a method for the stubborn?

Are any specific substances mentioned?

Malcolm wrote:

The commentary to the Single Son Of All the Buddhas Tantra in the Vima Nyingthig. Datura. It is used for invoking mundane visions to show that our mundane vision and our mundane mind are plastic, not rigid. People who have never tripped often have a subtle clinging to their minds as being immutable, which is hard to overcome merely through standard forms of practice. That said, no one should construe from this that I am insisting that people run right out and find acid or shrooms. Also, improperly used, ayahuasca can cause provocation problems, very serious.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 28th, 2016 at 10:44 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Trump definitely has the Fascist vote, whether he wants it or not:

<http://www.politico.com/story/2016/02/donald-trump-jean-marie-le-pen-endorsement-219896>

<http://www.cnn.com/2015/08/25/politics/david-duke-donald-trump-immigration/>

Fascists know their own...

And the idea that Trump is a bodhisattva emanation is pure delusion...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 28th, 2016 at 10:26 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is merely one, and very incomplete definition. And here, it clearly refers to realization of the nature of things, not to the things themselves.

Astus said:

Please clarify what problem you see there.

Malcolm wrote:

You defined dharmakaya as dependent origination. This is a clear error.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 28th, 2016 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Astus said:

Dharmakaya is interdependence itself.

Sherab Dorje said:

In which case it cannot be dependently arising since (according to Nagarjuna) something cannot arise from itself as a cause.

Astus said:

Change does not come from change, it is merely a concept. Dharmakaya is the nature of buddhas, dharmadhatu is the nature of everything, and both are emptiness, and emptiness is dependent origination.

Based on statements made in

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.028.than.html> and

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn22/sn22.087x.wlsh.html> we read this in the Shalistamba Sutra (tr N. Ross Reat, p 32):

"How, then, does one see conditioned arising? In this connection, it is said by the Lord: 'Whoever sees-this conditioned arising (which is), always and ever devoid of soul, truly undistorted, without soul, unborn, not become, not made, not compounded, unobstructed, inconceivable, glorious, fearless, ungraspable, inexhaustible and by nature never stilled, (he sees Dharma). And whoever sees Dharma (which is) also always and ever devoid of soul... and by nature never stilled, he sees the unsurpassable Dharma-body, the Buddha, by exertion based on right knowledge in clear understanding of the noble Dharma.'"

Thus we see that it goes back to the earliest texts. May also check "Pratityasamutpada and Dharmadhatu in Early Mahayana Buddhism" in

<https://books.google.hu/books?id=9a7qBgAAQBAJ>, p 11-28. And there is also some East Asian teachings, in particular those of the Huayan school, where they discuss the dharmadhatu as total interdependence being the ultimate reality. As Sung-bae Park

sums up: "In the final analysis, the patriarchal faith which affirms that "I am Buddha" is the realization of the dharmadhatu of dependent origination." (Buddhist Faith and Sudden Enlightenment, p 26)

Malcolm wrote:

This is merely one, and very incomplete definition. And here, it clearly refers to realization of the nature of things, not to the things themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 28th, 2016 at 3:32 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I will simply restate what I have stated before, in terms of Dharma practice, hallucinogens have only one purpose, and that is for people who stubbornly cling to the idea that their minds are fixed substances, hallucinogens will undermine their stubborn clinging to this idea, that's it.

They hmay have other uses, but none Dharmic.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I guess that settles it then.

BTW, I noticed this new book in a bookstore last night:

<https://www.amazon.com/Sacred-Knowledge-Psychedelics-Religious-Experiences/dp/0231174063>

It looks promising.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it does, should they regard Garab Dorje as any sort of authority.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 28th, 2016 at 3:05 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I will simply restate what I have stated before, in terms of Dharma practice, hallucinogens have only one purpose, and that is for people who stubbornly cling to the idea that their minds are fixed substances, hallucinogens will undermine their stubborn clinging to this idea, that's it.

They may have other uses, but none Dharmic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 28th, 2016 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Jeff H said:

Interesting to see this thread pop up now.

Herbie, thanks for the tip. I downloaded the book on your recommendation and I'll check it out.

Malcolm, are you familiar with Hopkins' Final Exposition of Wisdom, and do you think I'll find that missing link of causality there? Can you be more specific about what I'm missing?

Malcolm wrote:

The back ground for discussing conditionality is found in the lengthy discussion of the six causes and four conditions in chapter two. One must be acquainted with these ideas from abhidharma if one really hopes to understand what is being critiqued by Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 27th, 2016 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it would render dependent origination unconditioned, and this is rejected even in Abhidharmakoshaśābhasya.

Sherab Dorje said:

Do you mean it would render the Dharmakaya conditioned? My understanding is that the Dharmakaya (Tathagatagarbha, Mahamudra, Dzogchen, etc...) is unconditioned.

Malcolm wrote:

It would have to be one way or the other. Anyway, Dharmakaya is the mind of all the buddhas, it is not dependent origination, it is the mind that abandons all that is to be abandoned and obtains all that is to be obtained.

Welcome back Greg.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 27th, 2016 at 8:57 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A racist, paranoid clown, followed by other racist, paranoid clowns.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 27th, 2016 at 7:55 PM

Title: Re: Inherency and the Object of Negation

Content:

Jeff H said:

Ok thanks, both of you. These answers give me some fodder to work with. What I hear is that both functioning things and interaction of any sort necessarily imply mutual dependence of some sort. I need to sit with that for a while.

I think I'm trying to scratch a spot I still can't quite reach ... or adequately describe to willing scratching assistants. It's been with me since I started with Tibetan Buddhism and I think it's something like a nagging idea that just maybe things could somehow be partially independent.

Anyway, an added bonus in this thread is hearing from you, Clive. Nice to see someone from the View On Buddhism forum here in DW!

Malcolm wrote:

most of your difficulty in understanding this point comes from not having properly understood the theory of causes and conditions laid out in Abhidharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 27th, 2016 at 5:32 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Astus said:

Dharmakaya is interdependence itself.

Sherab Dorje said:

In which case it cannot be dependently arising since (according to Nagarjuna) something cannot arise from itself as a cause.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it would render dependent origination unconditioned, and this is rejected even Abhidharmakoshabhasyam.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 27th, 2016 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

DGA said:

I have a slightly different take, Malcolm. Trump's real talent isn't business, it's acting like a businessman--performing the caricature of a tycoon according to the expectations of people who don't mix with the truly wealthy, but aspire to. This is why he was so much more successful as a public figure than a capitalist--his books, media appearances, and especially his reality show were more lucrative for him than his often losing investments have been.

Malcolm wrote:

Hence the importance of his BRAND.

DGA said:

Running for president is now just another grift. Politicians run for this office as a means to promote themselves as plausible media figures. It worked for Mike Huckabee for a while, and also for Sarah Palin for a while. It seems to be working for drowsy Ben Carson. They're running for a seat on a cable news network, a book deal, a lecture tour--you know, easy money. This has been a means for Trump to keep his media brand current.

Malcolm wrote:

We have the same take, my statement is merely laconic, as usual.

DGA said:

I would like to say something nice about Donald Trump now. I am earnestly thankful to Trump for being the first Republican of any stature to call out G.W. Bush's incompetence while campaigning for public office. All the pieties and make-believe held dear by supporters of the Bush clan decisively lost under Trump's rhetorical fist (this after Jeb Bush tried to get his brother's help in South Carolina, and said he'd do the president thing a lot like his brother did). For putting a nail in the coffin of the Bush dynasty, Mr Trump, I give you my heartfelt thanks. Too bad it was fourteen years late.

Malcolm wrote:

Don't count your chickens. You recall how many times Reagan ran for POTUS? Jeb Bush is young, he has at least two more POTUS campaigns in him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 27th, 2016 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Queequeg said:

Bernie does something similar to Hilary. He doesn't play that threading the needle focus group messaging. He starts with principles he believes and talks directly from there. Its why he appears genuine compared to Hilary with her head nodding and pointing at strangers in the crowd. Feel bad for her that she tries so hard and falls so flat no matter what.

Malcolm wrote:

However, the obvious difference between Trump and Sanders is that Trump does not actually believe in anything. He just wants to be POTUS. Frankly, Sanders is running because he sees that our country is on the brink of critical choices that will affect us for the next three generations. He actually cares, whereas Trump just does not want to see people littering the sidewalks outside Trump Tower — it hurts his brand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 27th, 2016 at 12:08 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But Buddhadharma is presented as a path to a mode of perception that is inconceivable.

undefineable said:

Here, it appears to me to be being presented as a path to a mode of non-perception (i.e. neither sentience nor non-sentience) - in public. Discussions as to the wisdom of debating sunyata in an open online forum have been had before here in any case, I believe

Malcolm wrote:

No, this would mean that Buddhahood never transcends the fourth formless ayatana. Some people may have this misunderstanding, but I have not seen anyone actually make this claim on this thread so far.

It is fine to discuss emptiness online, we are not ignorant peasants, nor are we committed to some eternalist tradition. And if they stumble across such discussions, so what?

"Buddhists" really need to lighten the f%%^ up.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 26th, 2016 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

undefineable said:

'Poison of emptiness'-type teachings, against presenting beginners with arguments such as panpsychism (I would argue) that cannot be understood intellectually, are still worth bearing in mind, I feel. Buddhism will put many people off if it is presented as a path to a mode of perception that is **completely** incomprehensible - regardless of the truth of that statement.

Malcolm wrote:

But Buddhadharma is presented as a path to a mode of perception that is inconceivable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 26th, 2016 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

DGA said:

That's something else to clarify. What's the difference between the categories "sentient beings" and "Buddhas"?

Malcolm wrote:

At base, sentient beings are afflicted, and have severe limitations in terms of their knowledge of phenomena. Buddhas have neither afflictions nor any limitations on what they may know.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 26th, 2016 at 8:59 PM

Title: Re: Overview on Sakya-Teachings?

Content:

WeiHan said:

Not sure if my understanding is correct.

Lam Dre is the most detailed and comprehensive Tantric Mahamudra system in its original Indian form to be ever preserved in Tibetan Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not correct. Lamdre is a heterogeneous system which uses the Vajra Verses of Virupa as an exegetical basis for organizing these heterogeneous elements into a path. For example, the 28 connate dharmas are from Dombhi Heruka's Sahajasiddhi, the method of meditating clarity and emptiness comes from Guhyasamaja Tantra and Saraha, etc. There are many such examples.

If you want a comprehensive overview, look at Treasures of the Sakya Lineage, there is a section on the history and teachings of Sakya I ghostwrote for Khenpo Migmar Tseten.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 26th, 2016 at 7:54 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

undefineable said:

a legitimate reaction to your apparent argument might be to cause as much suffering as you like because there's no such thing or spectrum as sentience

daelm said:

Actually, I think you're attributing far too much sophistication to us

Historically, it's been the denial of sentience to categories of being that results in appalling cruelties, not the attribution. The attribution of traits increases respect and reverses cruelties - it's one of the premises of anti-racism work, that a person you know in all their complexity and nuance can no longer be treated with cruelty, and it's the reason that soldiers are still trained to dehumanize the enemy as preparation for battle, why vivisection was normal, and so on. It's possible that in the future, people will draw the conclusion you suggest based on the recognition of sentience in more things, but that has never happened before.

It's also not likely to lead to Jainism. We recognise sentience in animals these days, but we still use them in ways that hurt them, often of necessity. We'll do the same with plants. It's the pragmatism of samsara. What will change, as it has and is busy doing with animals, is that our engagement becomes more nuanced and more complex.

d

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 25th, 2016 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Wayfarer said:

But my approach to the 'nature of mind' is different, in that I say that mind is never 'an object of perception' - it is not 'out there' and can't be known as any kind of essence, substance, or in any objective sense. It is always the 'unknown knower, the unseen seer', which is a pre-Buddhist idea from the Upanisads.

Astus said:

That kind of inherent knowing is indeed the atman of the Vedanta. In Buddhism that is completely refuted, so it cannot really serve as a definition of sentience.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, Wayfarer is a Vedantin.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 25th, 2016 at 8:48 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Wayfarer said:

I know that 'drawing the line' is difficult, but there are still differences between animals and plants, organisms and minerals, humans and non-human creatures. The fact that those differences are hard to specify exactly, doesn't mean they're not real. And I will

stand by the claim that animals and humans are sentient beings, while sunflowers and jellyfish are not.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, dogmatism is always comforting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 25th, 2016 at 6:46 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Jeff H said:

Malcolm, you have said if Hilary gets it you would vote Green Party. Isn't that a de facto vote for Trump (assuming he gets it)? A write-in for Bernie would be the same, I think. How about Cruz or Rubio vs. Hilary?

Malcolm wrote:

Clinton will not win in a Trump/Clinton face off.

Bernie however will. So I submit to you, a vote in the primary for Clinton is a vote for Trump.

Bernie or bust!!!

Anyway, I am not voting against the GOP. I am voting for Bernie Sanders.

If American voters are stupid enough to think that Hillary represents a real choice, they deserve the consequences of their folly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 25th, 2016 at 6:44 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

dmr82 said:

It's called leadership.

Malcolm wrote:

It's called demagoguery. Trump is no leader. He is fool, but those who vote for him are greater fools still.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 25th, 2016 at 2:46 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Caucuses suck. Hillary's campaign staff cheated big time.

DGA said:

Cheating sucks. Both parties suck for running such undemocratic processes.

Malcolm wrote:

Bern it all down.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 25th, 2016 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Caucuses suck. Hillary's campaign staff cheated big time.

David N. Snyder said:

Election update:

Republicans:

Trump has now won New Hampshire, South Carolina, and Nevada

Cruz has won Iowa (barely)

Trump with big lead with 82 delegates so far

Cruz in 2nd place with 17 delegates

Democrats:

Hillary Clinton 52 delegates

Bernie Sanders 51 delegates

However, if you add in the Super delegates:

Hillary Clinton: 503

Bernie Sanders 70

So far it's looking like Hillary Clinton vs. Donald Trump

Wait a minute now which one is Republican and which one is Democrat?

(Hillary was a Republican in her youth and has ties to Wall Street and Trump espoused liberal ideas not too many years ago and is now a conservative)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 25th, 2016 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The first two are based in sensations, the last is not.

Astus said:

That would make it a purely theoretical category. On the other hand, that "all fabrications/compounded are suffering", that is because they are impermanent and therefore do not provide stability, while at the same time one craves for something to rely on.

Malcolm wrote:

Whatever, this is how Shariputta teaches it in the Majjhima Nikāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 25th, 2016 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Alan Wallace - any experiences with his retreats?

Content:

lunak said:

thank you for your opinion, as I mentioned - I am already decided

but I have to disagree with this statement of yours: when everyone is still extremely open, vulnerable, impressionable and not yet integrated into regular life (or even regular communication), they press you really hard for contributions. I found this in bad taste. I base on my and my friends' cases; I didn't feel any pressing, and my friends either, with many Vipassana retreats being done. Moreover - I know people, who really didn't give much, or nothing, and nobody "pressed" them in any way. I am sorry if this happened to you, but still I would avoid generalizing your case to whole community.

Adamantine said:

Let me clarify: I was not personally pressed. However right after we broke silence we were all ushered into a room where we were shown videos about how great Vipassana was and the prison experiments they've done which seemed fantastic but that bordered on propaganda, and then a long talk was given about how important it was to give donations so that other people could do the retreats, basically strongly encouraging reciprocity. They also were expecting to take donations on the spot, and were ready to accept credit cards, etc. When you come out of 10 days of absolutely no communication and then are made to sit through a type of fundraising drive it is more than an assault on the senses and makes one feel uncomfortable especially if one doesn't have much to offer. That's why I would prefer to have it really clear from the beginning that either I am a) offering something up front to cover costs or b) receiving the generosity of a sponsorship / scholarship. Financial issues are really the last thing I want to be confronted with thinking about immediately upon my reentry from retreat. I found it extremely abrasive. Perhaps that was just the case at that time and place in that

location (a large center in Massachusetts which they were actively renovating / expanding) and it is different depending on where you are and who is in charge of the retreat. However I got the impression that it was part of the overall formula.

Malcolm wrote:

Goenka Vipassana is kind of cultish, if you ask me (no one did, but still).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 24th, 2016 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I did a three year retreat on Lamdre, meditating all these topics step by step, and I disagree with you as to what this passage means.

However, Tshog bshad is excessively scholastic. I prefer the earlier view of the Lamdre path as expressed by Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen. I just prefer the pre-Sakya Pandita version of Sakya Vajrayāna teachings.

You are also neglecting the fact that the experiential vision part actually encompasses both the brief presentation of sūtra as well as Vajrayāna. The way things are explained in original Lamdre texts is very different than the Kadampaized and truncated Three Visions literature, which is quite late, actually, dating from the 14th century at the earliest, in Lama Dampa's commentaries.

Ngorchon Konchog Lhundrup was overly influenced by Kagyus (it's a fact, you can look it up), and I think this explains his gradualism to a large extent. Also his presentation of the view is felt to be somewhat hinky in some Sakyapa quarters.

M

Ivo said:

What you explain rings true. I am just sharing the way I was taught. I was explicitly instructed to do it step by step. I was young, diligent, did it well but did not like it particularly and switched to my own tradition the first moment I could. Later I read some things by Drakpa Gyaltsen and indeed he sounded like a yogi to me, something I definitely liked. But I didn't have the opportunity to study in depth other presentations of the Lam Dre, nor the slob bshad. I have no doubt that the Three Visions were "Kadampaized", it's quite obvious. Virupa would probably be quite amused by this development. Thanks for the clarification, it makes sense.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, the Three Visions/Three Tantras literature is one, an attempt to provide a coherent graded path, second, a system of delivering the essentials of Lamdre, which is

a vast heterogeneous system, into a single text convenient to teach to a large assembly. However, this stream lining has some notable downsides.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 24th, 2016 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The suffering of being conditioned.

Astus said:

Even for that there should be some experience present. Unconsciousness means no experience whatsoever. Or it simply means the general attribute of appearances being unsatisfactory, but even then, for those without mind there are no appearances.

Malcolm wrote:

There are three kinds of suffering: suffering of suffering, suffering of change, and the suffering of being compounded. The first two are based in sensations, the last is not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 24th, 2016 at 10:50 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Wayfarer said:

A

So I am inclined to think that 'sentience' figures, on this scale, in the animal-human realms, i.e. plants are not sentient beings. (Interesting to note above that the prohibition on killing trees in the Pali texts was so as not to disturb the tree-devas, not because trees themselves are classified as 'sentient'.)

Malcolm wrote:

How is this different than not killing an animal so as not to disturb their minds? The body is not sentient in itself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 24th, 2016 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

DGA said:

If Trump wins the nomination, look forward to another Clinton presidency, and perhaps

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nevada), again.

Malcolm wrote:

I disagree. If Trump and Clinton face off, Trump wins. Sanders is the only one who beats Trump.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 24th, 2016 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

seeker242 said:

I think you could say that a "sentient being" is a being who experiences dukkha.

Astus said:

There is a heaven of unconscious gods (asamjnisattva). What sufferings do they have?

Malcolm wrote:

The suffering of being conditioned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 24th, 2016 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Ivo said:

[

This is completely in accord with the oral instructions of the Lam Dre as I have received it from several masters, with the sutra part being gradual and progression to each subsequent stage entirely dependent on obtaining the specific signs of accomplishment of the previous one, according to the texts. This is how I have been led to do it myself, mostly in retreat. And the Hevajra wangs come after the completion of the preliminary contemplations of the pure vision. This intent is also extremely clearly explained by Ngorchon throughout his commentary on the sutra part, where he explicitly states after each stage what one should achieve before progressing. It is throughout the whole text.

Yes, some masters teach it differently, especially when they teach the Lob She in one go, but the above is still a very alive tradition, and I have personally been led through it.

Malcolm wrote:

I did a three year retreat on Lamdre, meditating all these topics step by step, and I disagree with you as to what this passage means.

However, Tshog bshad is excessively scholastic. I prefer the earlier view of the Lamdre

path as expressed by Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen. I just prefer the pre-Sakya Pandita version of Sakya Vajrayāna teachings.

You are also neglecting the fact that the experiential vision part actually encompasses both the brief presentation of sūtra as well as Vajrayāna. The way things are explained in original Lamdre texts is very different than the Kadampaized and truncated Three Visions literature, which is quite late, actually, dating from the 14th century at the earliest, in Lama Dampa's commentaries.

Ngorchon Konchog Lhundrup was overly influenced by Kagyus (it's a fact, you can look it up), and I think this explains his gradualism to a large extent. Also his presentation of the view is felt to be somewhat hinky in some Sakyapa quarters.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 24th, 2016 at 6:00 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Ever heard of a thumbprint? I've only heard third-hand accounts and read reports online, but it sounds insane. Supposedly you start tripping the instant it touches your tongue... and lasts for days or weeks.

Ivo said:

Not the tongue, your palm. Originally, you would just press it into your palm. It is still done, although rare.

I am with Malcolm on this, with the addition that certain substances, most notably DMT (including Ayahuasca), Psilocybin, LSD and, with caution, MDMA, can definitely be helpful for serious practitioners in a retreat setting, used extremely sparingly. And they have indeed been proven to be very helpful for PTSD, addictions and other things in a clinical setting. 90% of the people commenting on this thread admit that they have not even tried anything, how can you know if it is useful or not? Even Urgen Rinpoche had said that it can be useful for an advanced practitioner, as quoted by DJKR (who himself is not exactly innocent).

Having said that, all these things are a total distraction for the dualistic mind, and it seems that people with no stability in meditation can not use them much, as it becomes just another movie to watch, at best. So it is not "yes" or "no". It is something very powerful, which can be very dangerous in the wrong hands (most hands) and quite useful in skilled hands.

If one considers himself/herself a good meditator but is afraid to try a safe mind altering

substance, as the first three above, it is quite funny. How will you cope when you die and loose all reference points? You can easily check how well you can handle the bardo state with a good dose of DMT. If you are honest with yourself it may be a great incentive to get back to the cushion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 24th, 2016 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Matt J said:

If we reduce Buddhanture to impermanence, or more broadly, emptiness, I think that is not accurate. For example, this completely ignores the Third Turning sutras, and simply promotes the Second Turning as supreme. Personally, I think that what Dogen is referring when he says all things are Buddhanature is the non-duality of subject and object.

Astus said:

What school advocates those ideas of turnings?

Malcolm wrote:

An early version of Yogacara centered in Korea, preserved in the Tibetan canon, and I assume, the Chinese canon as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 24th, 2016 at 5:57 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Therefore, the mere fact that plants are capable of metabolism implies directly that they are capable of cognition. Hence they are sentient.

Astus said:

OK, let's start there then, that plants are sentient beings. What brings a being to be born as a plant? Is that a separate type of birth, or should it be included among animals, considering that they could be taken as the dumbest form of existence? Why was that not recognised by the Buddha and his followers?

Malcolm wrote:

Simple put, the conventions of the day generally circumscribed what "sentient" could mean.

I don't think we can consider plants "dumb," their intelligence is as inscrutable to us as the intelligence of some alien race. But obviously Buddha placed importance on not harming plants, and we can observed this from Vinaya, among other places.

In the end, the basic failure of these conversations derives from the traditionalist urge to argue from some perceived "authority." It's like arguing that Meru Cosmology should be accepted at face value.

Then there is this — when you cut a planarian flatworm in two, it becomes two separate creatures. If you cut it into tiny pieces, each piece will regenerate as a separate individual.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Planarian>

Are planarians sentient beings? I think so. This then raises the question of how such consciousness that they possess individuates when a whole planarian is split into two or more viable segments. It seems that all creatures beyond the range of complexity of planarians lack this ability.

The more we learn about the physical world, the more it causes us to pause, and take stock of many longheld Buddhist assumptions, like the one that plants are nonsentient life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 24th, 2016 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

daelm said:

this is honestly the same point that Shantideva makes in the bodhicarya - basically, he says you only care about this suffering and not that, because this suffering falls within the locus of data that you regard as you. (the boundary of embodiment, essentially). he then says that real wisdom follows the opening of those boundaries.

Malcolm wrote:

With negative consequences for those who regard animals privileged with respect to consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 24th, 2016 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Ivo said:

From the oral explanations of the Lam Dre I have received I remember instructions for up to 7 days of śamatha (single session) as a prerequisite for the next stage of vipaśyanā.

dzogchungpa said:

I'm not sure I understand. Do you mean 7 days of seated śamatha, focusing on an

object etc., no sleeping and eating or whatever?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you have to use a specially blessed vajra catheter and pee bag...

Just kidding of course, but in reality, no one does this, and I never heard this before, nor have I read it in any text connected with Lamdre.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 24th, 2016 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Ivo said:

Ngorchen Konchok Lhundrup in his exposition on the Lam De Tsog She prescribes a capacity to do a single śamatha session of 24 hours or more as a prerequisite to proceed further on the path.

Malcolm wrote:

While he certainly says that by doing short sessions one gradually can remain in śamatha for twenty four hours, he certainly never makes it a precondition for moving along to vipaśyāna, or even Vajrayāna. And certainly, it is the case that that reciting the Hevajra sadhana itself is regarded as the best means of traversing the nine stages of śamatha in Lamdre, as it is described in some detail in Saroruhavajra's creation stage commentary contained within the Eight subsequent path cycles of Lamdre, which is part of the Yellow Volume.

Jetsun Dragpa Gyaltsen criticizes the view that one must train excessively in sūtra before moving on the Vajrayāna practice, and this is one reason why Sakya masters tend to bestow the Hevajra empowerment right away, because they take a cig car approach based on Jetsun Rinpoche's clarification of disagreement over how best to understand the statement in the Five Stages of Nāgārjuna that, "This [Vajrayāna] is a gradual path." He asserts that sudden entry into Vajrayāna is implied by Aryadeva's amplification on this point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 24th, 2016 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[

...the original Maturana/Varela book the intent of the term is to define living systems.

daelm said:

snap.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, for we who supposedly are just arguing from opinion and not on the basis of fact or reason, we seem to have amassed quite a bit of science, fact and reason.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 24th, 2016 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Matt J said:

If we reduce Buddhanture to impermanence, or more broadly, emptiness, I think that is not accurate. For example, this completely ignores the Third Turning sutras, and simply promotes the Second Turning as supreme. Personally, I think that what Dogen is referring when he says all things are Buddhanature is the non-duality of subject and object.

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize that this way of ascribing sūtras is very historically faulty and does not correspond with how Indian masters understood the concept.

Mother's Lap said:

Which was the Korean master that Buton copied? Wonch'uk?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 24th, 2016 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Matt J said:

If we reduce Buddhanture to impermanence, or more broadly, emptiness, I think that is not accurate. For example, this completely ignores the Third Turning sutras, and simply promotes the Second Turning as supreme. Personally, I think that what Dogen is referring when he says all things are Buddhanature is the non-duality of subject and object.

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize that this way of ascribing sūtras is very historically faulty and does not correspond with how Indian masters understood the concept.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 24th, 2016 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, or anybody, do you consider the Earth to be a sentient being? I'm open to the idea myself.

Malcolm wrote:

Not in particular. But I am willing to symbolically treat it that way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 24th, 2016 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Astus said:

Also, the Wikipedia article itself quotes instances of mechanical and other phenomena that could be called self-producing.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think you paid careful attention to the article. While the concept of autopoietic machines was indeed brought up in the original Maturana/Varela book the intent of the term is to define living systems. However, in reference to your citation about food: Now, the next step consists of going from these very general considerations to the practical case of biological and chemical systems. Clearly, all that has just been said about cognition can be abstracted from the notion of metabolism. When an amoeba or any other living cell chooses the metabolites from the environment and rejects catabolites in it, this corresponds to a dynamic interaction that permits the enacting and the coming to being of both the living organism and the environment. Therefore, metabolism is already by itself the biological correlate of the notion of cognition. In this sense, our view is slightly different from the predicament of Bourguin and Stewart (2004), who write 'autopoiesis focuses naturally on the internal functioning of the organism, notably its metabolism; cognition naturally thematizes the inter- actions between an organism and its environment'. We believe in fact that metabolism is not only a property of the interior of the living organism. Metabolism cannot exist permanently without (mutual) interaction with the environment. In this active interaction, the organism selects its material, and in this sense a full- blown metabolism is tantamount to cognition.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1618936/pdf/16849156.pdf>

In other words, metabolism implies cognition, but machines do not choose in any sense their metabolites as opposed to their catabolites. Their consumption of "metabolites" would not be an autopoietic choice, but an allopoietic choice, a constraint imposed upon it by external programming; for example, a production line.

Therefore, the mere fact that plants are capable of metabolism implies directly that they are capable of cognition. Hence they are sentient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 23rd, 2016 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, computers merely mimic sentience, they are not self-organizing. Self-organization is the hallmark of all living systems and is the benchmark for sentience.

Astus said:

What counts as self-organising? Programs have organisation skills, they can even learn and reproduce.

Malcolm wrote:

There is a difference between the self-producing (autopoiesis) self-organization of living systems and static, other-produced (exopoietic) "self-organization" of inanimate things, like crystals. The latter only appear to be self-organizing, but are incapable of sustaining themselves.

So we need to add to this definition that not only are living systems self-organizing, but they are also autopoietic, self-producing.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Autopoiesis>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 23rd, 2016 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Trees, plants, fungi and so in in general, breath, grow, excrete, defend themselves, communicate within their own communities and other communities, and using fungi as a web for other plants to communicate, they respond to stimulus, learn, and so on.

Astus said:

Then we might consider computers are already or about to be sentient as well. And maybe a number of other phenomena too, like memes.

Malcolm wrote:

No, computers merely mimic sentience, they are not self-organizing. Self-organization is the hallmark of all living systems and is the benchmark for sentience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 23rd, 2016 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: What is a "sentient being"?

Content:

Astus said:
a tree or a stone...

Malcolm wrote:
Trees and stones are not commensurate examples, therefore your analogy is flawed.

Trees, plants, fungi and so in in general, breath, grow, excrete, defend themselves, communicate within their own communities and other communities, an using fungi as as a web for other plants to communicate, they respond to stimulus, learn, and so on.

The only things plants cannot do as opposed to animals is move themselves from one place to another because their brains aka roots and the vast majority of their sense organs are buried in the ground.

Stones, and rocks, etc. in general exhibit no living properties whatsoever.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, February 23rd, 2016 at 4:59 AM
Title: Re: Understanding Rangtong and Shentong as Non-Contradictory
Content:

Bakmoon said:
Wow, very helpful. If the Great Jamgong Kongtrul means it in this sense (that ultimate reality is conventionally existent, but ultimately is free from all extremes) then I can see very easily that Rangtong and Shentong are intended to be compatible. I'd love to get more clarification on this point.

Malcolm wrote:
Rang stong is a straw man position invented by gzhan stong pas. There is no such thing as "rang stong", apart from the frebile imaginations of its proponents.

Bakmoon said:
I personally don't really accept the Rangtong/Shentong aspect of Kagyu doxography either, but that's the lingo within the tradition and the teachers who say this, so I thought it best to present my question in the terminology of the way I heard it, at least out of courtesy for the forum I'm posting in.

Malcolm wrote:
It comes from Jonang originally.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, February 23rd, 2016 at 4:46 AM
Title: Re: Understanding Rangtong and Shentong as Non-Contradictory
Content:

Bakmoon said:
Wow, very helpful. If the Great Jamgong Kongtrul means it in this sense (that ultimate

reality is conventionally existent, but ultimately is free from all extremes) then I can see very easily that Rangtong and Shentong are intended to be compatible. I'd love to get more clarification on this point.

Malcolm wrote:

Rang stong is a straw man position invented by gzhan stong pas. There is no such thing as "rang stong", apart from the feeble imaginations of its proponents.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 23rd, 2016 at 2:59 AM

Title: Re: [Split: Chopping down trees and] Veganism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So you agree there is no strict demarcation, and the demarcation drawn is strictly dogmatic and not based on reason or science.

seeker242 said:

What I agree on is that the idea that plants are sentient is personal opinion based on mere conjecture, not reason or science.

Malcolm wrote:

Brilliant Green: The Surprising History and Science of Plant Intelligence

by Stefano Mancuso (Author), Alessandra Viola (Author), Joan Benham (Translator), Michael Pollan (Foreword)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 23rd, 2016 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Jeff, the point is that in Tibet in the Gelug tradition, śamatha meditation was not especially emphasized, historically.

The fact is that Sakyas and Gelugpas don't do much sūtrayāna style śamatha because they think sadhana practice (reciting texts, chanting mantras, and so on) is a more effective means to reach the same goal.

Karinos said:

According to my Gelugpa Lama (Desi Rinpoche - Drepung Loseling) practitioners of tantra are practising śamatha and vipassana simultaneously during deity yoga sadhana practice, respectively during generation and completion stage.

Malcolm wrote:
Glad you agree with me.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, February 22nd, 2016 at 12:37 PM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016
Content:
maybay said:
Whims of the people bounded by 101 cultural imperatives you've so casually ignored.

Malcolm wrote:
Tell that the two poor bastards that were recently lynched by townspeople in southern Mexico based on false rumors. Have you been to these places? I have. I like Mexico. But it is not a safe country precisely because laws, and the Government which is supposed to enforce them, are weak.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, February 22nd, 2016 at 10:15 AM
Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
There really is no strict demarcation for how sentient beings can appear, based on their karma.

seeker242 said:
Which is probably why the traditional view of all forms of Buddhism is that they are non-sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:
So you agree there is no strict demarcation, and the demarcation drawn is strictly dogmatic and not based on reason or science.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, February 22nd, 2016 at 12:28 AM
Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism
Content:

seeker242 said:
And where can the Gaia sutra be found? And where within the sutra does it say that? Chapter, section etc?

Malcolm wrote:

If you have to read it, you won't understand it since it is all around you, living, thinking and breathing, expressed through all the life on this planet.

seeker242 said:

So you claim... And also a convenient way to avoid the question. Because you avoided the question, it's safe to assume you can't answer it.

Malcolm wrote:

I am making a different point.

I can show you texts, sūtras, which mention Mt. Meru. But no one has found Mt. Meru. So this indicates that perhaps sūtras are not the infallible authority to you take them to be. I don't depend on sūtras to define my cosmology for me. Do you? Do you therefore insist that the sun and moon travel around Mt. Meru? If so, how is it that the whole world does not fall into darkness all at the same time when the Sun rounds Meru?

Further, there is the story of Saṃgharaṣita in the Śikṣāsamuccaya which states: Saṃgharaṣita, those sentient beings who have turned into the forms of trees, leaves, flowers and fruits, in the past they were monks. Because they partook of the trees, leaves, flowers and fruits of the Saṅgha, they have turned into the form of trees, leaves, flowers and fruits

There really is no strict demarcation for how sentient beings can appear, based on their karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 21st, 2016 at 11:33 PM

Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism

Content:

seeker242 said:

What sutra says plants are sentient beings?

Malcolm wrote:

The Gaia Sūtra.

seeker242 said:

And where can the Gaia sutra be found? And where within the sutra does it say that? Chapter, section etc?

Malcolm wrote:

If you have to read it, you won't understand it since it is all around you, living, thinking and breathing, expressed through all the life on this planet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 21st, 2016 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism

Content:

seeker242 said:

...plants are not sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

So you keeping claiming.

seeker242 said:

What sutra says plants are sentient beings?

Malcolm wrote:

The Gaia Sūtra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 21st, 2016 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Sadhana Practice

Content:

Adamantine said:

I don't really see a contradiction

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I think it is false assessment.

Why? Because we have evidence from Mañjuśrīkīrti's Ornamenting the Essence of General Rites of All Secrets that there was a movement in India, led by Śrī Śiṅha (mentioned by name, along with Bhikṣuni Nanda, Padmasambhava's teacher as well, and other masters), who argued that creation stage practices was taught only to reject annihilationism, and for those who believed a dependent originated result was accomplished through dependent origination, and for those worldly people who were terrified of the profound meaning. However they argued that such practice was incapable of producing the result because a result cannot arise from a dissimilar cause.

Indeed, Tsongkhapa cites this argument in his sNgags rim chen mo in an implicit refutation of Dzogchen.

The basic argument is that creation stage practices were unnecessary, and that it was sufficient to rely solely on completion stage practices.

The counter position to the above is that the natural purity of all phenomena was incapable of stopping false conceptuality and that buddhahood was necessarily predicated on the accumulation of merit, that the creation stage was needed to

abandon ordinary vision, and that it was necessary for accomplished the rūpakāyas in order to benefit sentient beings.

The passage is interesting because it is just about the only passage in all the gsar ma period translations from Sanskrit which address the Great Perfection movement in India (albeit through the names of its promulgators rather than specific texts) and its positions, and contrasts this with what we now take to be the more conventional Vajrayāna approach.

In other words, I don't see much evidence that Vairocana, for example, was collecting lots of deity practices in India and spreading them among Tibetans. While it is certainly true there is a Vimalamitra tradition of Vajrakīlaya, and while it is certainly true that Dzogchen can be practiced by people engaged in the creation stage and other kinds of rites, it is also the case that we have examples such as Pang Mipham Gonpo who appear to have practiced only Dzogchen.

In short, despite SVS's lengthy, interesting and erudite articles, I do not think it is accurate to conclude that Dzogchen was necessarily an adjunct to the practice of the two stages, and I think there is ample evidence to the contrary.

I think the more accurate position to take (based for example, on Mañjuśrīmitra's Meditation of Bodhicitta) is that buddhahood could also be accomplished indirectly as well, through mantra practice, as he says:

Further, because the teacher has declared that awakening can be correctly grasped with a symbol,

in that case, this is the basis of the meditation that generates awakened mind.

After the three samadhis are stable, and after binding three symbolic mudras, generate the mind as the great dharmamudra and meditate the recitation of the essence [mantra].

Mipham, summarizing Mañjuśrīmitra's autocommentary, adds:

If it is asked, "What is the method of realizing the definitive meaning through the indirect method?," since nonactivity is illustrated with the activity of fabricated efforts, like pointing to the moon with the finger, also awakened mind correctly grasped through a symbol will accomplish awakening, because the Bhagavan Buddha, the teacher of devas and humans, has declared that it is "great awakening." Any unfortunate one who conceptualizes entities should make efforts in the indirect method of realization. Thus, I argue that "early" Dzogchen had nothing to do with sadhana practice at all, and this is proven quite handily by looking at the the bodhicitta texts (should one assume they represent "early" Dzogchen). Does this mean that Dzogchen masters ruled out an indirect path for unfortunates? No. But it does mean the premise "early dzogchen...was originally inseparable from sadhana practice" is false.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 21st, 2016 at 10:09 PM

Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism

Content:

seeker242 said:

...plants are not sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

So you keeping claiming.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 21st, 2016 at 5:46 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Sadhana Practice

Content:

Adamantine said:

This series of articles explores early dzogchen and how it was originally inseparable from sadhana practice. Seems like essential reading for anyone following this thread:

Malcolm wrote:

This assumes that the traditional account of the spread of Dzogchen in Tibet is a Tibetan fabrication...

[cue: fabrications are really terrible, aren't they.]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 21st, 2016 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If you seriously want to learn śamatha, don't study with Nyingmapas, don't study with Gelugpas, or Sakyapas — study with the Kagyus. They are the Tibetan school that is the most serious about this form of meditation. They have the most accumulated experience in this, and are the best teachers for it.

dzogchungpa said:

This is kind of interesting to me. Why is it that the Kagyus are sort of the specialists in this, among the 4 schools?

Malcolm wrote:

I think it has mostly to do with Gampopa, truth be told.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 21st, 2016 at 4:45 AM

Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism

Content:

Fortyeightvows said:

maybe because of the object involved. killing one's parents is more serious than killing a person who is not one's parents, which is more serious than killing an animal, etc.
Does that work?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a question what works or not. I am quite certain that the vow against taking life was primarily against killing humans, while the commitment of nonharming extends to all living things, plants and animals alike. It is for the latter reason that we see so many of the pācittiyas such as not killing animals, not destroying plants, not digging in the ground, not drinking alcohol, etc. are involved with avoiding harms of many kinds.

We do not live in that world anymore, where murderers like Angulimala could operate with impunity. We live in a different kind of world now.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 21st, 2016 at 4:19 AM

Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Killing an animal does not violate the first precept, only killing humans does.

Fortyeightvows said:

Buddhist Religions: A Historical Introduction (Fourth edition, Page 77-78)

by Richard H. Robinson and Thanissaro Bhikkhu:

"The first precept is to refrain from killing living beings, meaning all sorts of animals but not plants. The precept is broken if, knowing that something is a living being and intending to kill it, one attempts to do so and succeeds."

Thats how it is traditionally taught. If all four parts are there.....

Malcolm wrote:

If this is the case, you are then left with explaining why killing animals is a minor violation for monks, along with destroying plants.

Are the standards for lay people higher and more stringent than for monks? I don't think so.

I think the sentience of plants is an issue where Buddhadharma will need to catch up with science.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 21st, 2016 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Jeff H said:

Ok. I certainly bow to you guys.

I was reacting to the fact that LZR was speaking to FPMT, where, in my short time, I've always heard and read that meditation is an important practice. Usually not group meditations, which tend to be short adjuncts to teachings, but a personal, daily practice. I thought that was in line with a history of long retreats and hermit meditators in Tibet. And I thought he was saying that such a serious meditation tradition needs to be cultivated in the west.

Malcolm wrote:

If you seriously want to learn śamatha, don't study with Nyingmapas, don't study with Gelugpas, or Sakyapas — study with the Kagyus. They are the Tibetan school that is the most serious about this form of meditation. They have the most accumulated experience in this, and are the best teachers for it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 21st, 2016 at 3:43 AM

Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism

Content:

seeker242 said:

No one in their right mind would think that killing a carrot would be a violation of the first precept... The idea that killing plants and animals has the same consequences has no basis.

Malcolm wrote:

Killing an animal does not violate the first precept, only killing humans does.

seeker242 said:

The fact that they are the same level of precepts does not establish this and is irrelevant.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes it does, and no it is not. The vows are the same in Sarvastivada, etc., as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 11:04 PM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Jeff H said:

This seems like an uncharacteristically selective reading of the LZR advice. It sounded to me like his main point went more like this: The initial westward spread of Tibetan Buddhism has been based on the monastic tradition which, in Tibet, came to emphasize study over meditation. Westerners have adopted the intellectual track, and that is good. But now, to make the transference deeper, more meaningful, and longer

lasting, it is time to revive the well established Tibetan practice of meditation in earnest. To do that would be, "wow, wow, wow!"

Geshe Jampa Gyatso came around to the same view, and the meditation LZR is talking about is not at all the popularized form of western meditation.

Malcolm wrote:

Jeff, the point is that in Tibet in the Gelug tradition, śamatha meditation was not especially emphasized, historically.

The fact is that Sakyas and Gelugpas don't do much sūtrayāna style śamatha because they think sadhana practice (reciting texts, chanting mantras, and so on) is a more effective means to reach the same goal.

However, based on the model of Trungpa's Dharmadhātu, a lot of Western centers adopted courses in śamatha because they noticed that to some extent, people with background in Zen and Vipassana and so on had less difficulties with their practice in general and more stability, especially emotionally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism

Content:

seeker242 said:

And that would be a line. I said no Lines!

Virgo said:

So stepping on an ant is the same as killing a turtle, or a human (gasp)? And all are equal to uprooting a flower?

Kevin

seeker242 said:

If you don't draw lines, yea. Which is why drawing no lines is nonsensical. If they are not equal, then you have to be drawing a line somewhere. Drawing lines is quite appropriate. The Buddha himself drew lines between plants and animals. This is the reason why killing a carrot and eating it is not a precepts violation. Meanwhile, killing a sheep and eating it is.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha also made distinctions between killing humans on the one hand, and killing animals and killing plants on the other.

Killing a human being is parajika.

Killing animals and killing plants break the same level of precepts. In Theravada, they belong to the 92 pācittiyas. So in Buddha's view, we can see that harming animals and harming plants have the same consequences.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 12:05 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Virgo said:

"We are a government of laws, not of men" - The Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

kirtu said:

Often quoted generally to rail against injustice.

But the reality is that the US is a republic of men (people) who manipulate the law for their own purposes.

As I told a Gay diplomat in the late-80's who was being railroaded by the State Department.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Think it is bad here, go to Mexico, India, China, etc. These really are countries where laws are subordinate to whims of people. The US may have its problems, but it really is a country of laws, at least in white communities. If you are black or latino, however, forget it. Sadly, with the dismantling of the middle class, it is slowly becoming one law for the 99%, another for the 1%.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 12:02 PM

Title: Re: Madhyamakavatara and Conventional Production from Other

Content:

Bakmoon said:

I've been reviewing the Madhyamakavatara with several commentaries recently and hit a snag with verse 6.32 where the example of a man fathering a child or planting a tree as showing that production from other isn't a part of worldly convention because the cause and effect aren't seen as being different.

I just don't see how that isn't production from other, because in those examples the cause is one thing and the result is another. What am I missing?

Malcolm wrote:
Conditions.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 12:01 PM
Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?
Content:
Virgo said:
<http://cdn.fpmt.org/wp-content/uploads/teachers/zopa/advice/Actualizing-realizations-LZR-wish-2013.pdf?2f77d7>

KEvin

Malcolm wrote:
"When the first Masters Program finished I asked the students to do a one-year retreat on the lam- rim after studying for eight years. Geshe Jampa Gyatso didn't have much interest in meditation because in the monasteries they don't usually do this. "

As I said, a lot of this is being driven by a Western mania for meditation.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 8:25 AM
Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
I have been around Tibetan centers for years and frankly, in my observation, apart from Kagyus, nobody does much traditional sūtrayāna style śamatha and vipaśyāna, and definitely not in the monastery based practice that has been largely spread here in the West.

Adamantine said:
Shiné (shamatha) is offered as a regular group class and practice session at my local centers. It is also very much emphasized in the Dudjom Tersar as essential to developing on the path. Actually doing at least a 2-week solitary retreat focusing on silent shiné is considered something of an essential foundation. It probably wouldn't correspond to a sūtrayāna style śamatha in some ways since the techniques are coming from terma, and have Vajrayana and Atiyoga elements. However it is more or less synonymous for all intents and purposes, the basic intent is the same.

I am not as informed of the Gelugpa curriculums in western centers, I imagine different centers emphasize different trainings though.

Malcolm wrote:

I suspect our friend thinks that a silent two week retreat is a rather less than overwhelming achievement.

And seriously, Tibetans don't do much śamatha. And if they do, it is only in retreat. They prefer to chant books.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 8:19 AM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Adamantine said:

Perhaps by offering them a chance to see that what appeared to them in one way actually functions in another, if gazed at with a more subtle view. . . and that the basis for their negative judgment about Vajrayana practice is not experiential / i.e. coming from realization as they may like us to believe, but from conceptual hang ups that don't benefit anyone on or off the cushion.

Malcolm wrote:

Is your view really that subtle?

Adamantine said:

Then you're in the minority.

Malcolm wrote:

Minorities are really terrible, aren't they? [beat you to it, chung].

Adamantine said:

I never brought up Hades in the first place. However the latter (Gehinnom) is a place the wicked go to purify their misdeeds, sounds a lot like a conventional hell. But different from Hades, sure, however you simply said that Jews don't have any version of heaven or hell, which is incorrect.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they really don't. Gehenna is a charnel ground outside of Jerusalem.

Adamantine said:

Yet you neglected these passages from the New Testament in the given link:

"Fire and brimstone frequently appear as agents of divine wrath throughout the Book of Revelation culminating in chapters 19–21, wherein the devil and the ungodly are cast into a lake of fire and brimstone as an eternal punishment:"

"But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death" (Revelation 21:8, KJV).

"And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone" (Revelation 19:20, KJV)."

Which prove that the actual Christian doctrine of Hell involves fire and brimstone, which shows that your above statement "the actual Christian doctrine about Hell is not fire and brimstone" is incorrect.

Malcolm wrote:

If you read more, you will find that Christians do not generally interpret this literally, whatever else they may do.

Adamantine said:

I can certainly not confirm anything of the sort for Yogavajra, from his meager contributions here I couldn't say if he understands dependent origination or not. However by equating the tantric bonds willingly made between Guru and Chela with the motivation to benefit all beings by achieving liberation as soon as possible, with the non-consensual servitude to a vengeful Creator God who may cast you into Eternal fiery hell for the same human flaws he himself (supposedly) designed, it doesn't paint a pretty portrait for a deep understanding!

Malcolm wrote:

I suspect that the person in question decided that he just did not agree with the idea that if he left Vajrayāna he was going to hell, and part of the reason he left, was all constant discussions of lower realms, etc., that he probably does not believe in, on any level.

Adamantine said:

Likewise, I never said nor implied switching practice traditions would lead one to hell. This is a red-herring you've thrown into the mix and not representative of anything I've stated or implied. As I said before, it's quite possible to switch traditions and keep samaya.

Malcolm wrote:

What if you switch traditions because you have come to the conclusion that samaya is a bullshit control mechanism? And in fact, I have seen unqualified gurus use samaya in exactly that way.

Adamantine said:

Whether yogavajra is doing so is his own business. However once he starts conversations with Vajrayanists and insults the tradition, he does invite some degree of cross-examining scrutiny.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think he insulted anything.

Adamantine said:

Well, so far you're in the minority, perhaps the only minority in the room.

Malcolm wrote:

Minorities are really terrible, aren't they?

Adamantine said:

No, just inferring from his comments about Vajrayana. It doesn't seem at all likely to me that someone who sincerely practiced it for 20 years would say what he's been saying.

Malcolm wrote:

I have met quite a number of people who have switched because they finally decided that in the end, Vajrayāna was just prapañca.

Adamantine said:

Well, to be fair, if I go to a Broadway show and start heckling the performers, I could be rightfully labeled a heckler at that moment, in that context. Certainly I am also a person working with my own limitations as well, but due to my actions and intentions in that time and place the label "heckler" is more than adequate. Of course, that is not all I am, in that moment, in the past, or the future. Labels are temporary conventions, as are the names Malcolm and Adamantine. But when the shoe fits. . .

Malcolm wrote:

Yeah, I don't think he heckled anyone. He made the mistake of bothering to talk to holier than thou Vajrayānists and for that, he got what he deserved.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 8:08 AM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Every Tibetan center I've ever been to personally has it "on the menu" in one form or another, but I don't know how well attended. I always imagined that here it could be more an issue of local demographics too, i.e. who will attend what in a given community.

Of of my teachers (Sakya) emphasizes it pretty heavily, but I gather he is unique in that

regard.

I did not realize Gelug has little of it emphasized, I had assumed that it was part of their graduated path...probably an issue with my all over the place reading.

Malcolm wrote:

The modern emphasis on śamatha, apart from Kagyu schools, is driven mainly by the Western mania for "meditation", and peoples encounter with Shambhala, and before it, Dharmadhātu centers.

I am sure that if Yogavajra had started in a Dharmadhātu, he would have a very different perspective on sitting meditation in Tibetan Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 7:45 AM

Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Hello,

I will just note that most Buddhist Temples in North Asia (perhaps not Tibet for the walls themselves, although there are to be found many wooden objects within the Temples) are made of wood. That wood is unlikely to be all from trees which have fallen naturally, and in fact, comes from cut trees.

The monks also eat many vegetables while sitting on the wooden platforms. The vegetables had to be gathered in order to be eaten.

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:

And in Tibet, they mostly eat yaks and sheep.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 7:37 AM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Frankly, I don't see this disrespect.

I do, but it's nothing unusual on DW, coming from any quarter. He came here claiming to have 20 years practicing HYT in the Gelug tradition, and yet needed to ask about the place of silent meditation in Tibetan traditions?

Even if it weren't though, he continued to go on and basically call sadhana practice "lazy meditation", etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Steven Batchelor complained about the same thing. Gelugpas do not really do much śamatha traditionally. In fact, one common complaint about both Gelugpas and Sakyapas is that while they are very intellectual, they do not meditate much.

I have been around Tibetan centers for years and frankly, in my observation, apart from Kagyus, nobody does much traditional sūtrayāna style śamatha and vipaśyāna, and definitely not in the monastery based practice that has been largely spread here in the West.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 7:30 AM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Caodemarte said:

Just to get back to hell: Sheol is not hell. In Christianity hell can never be annihilation of the soul, which is eternal. In Catholicism, drawing from a long tradition from the Church fathers, it is currently defined as alienation or isolation from God (other sects may share this definition or have a different one). The sinner alienates himself/herself from God by unrepentant sin (if you are wondering, sin is that which alienates you from God). So if you are floating alone after the end of time you only have yourself to blame for imposing suffering on yourself!

Malcolm wrote:

Annihilationism today

Today many traditionalists claim that the doctrine is most often associated with groups descended from William Miller and the Adventist movement of the mid-1800s, including Seventh-day Adventists, Jehovah's Witnesses, and other Adventist groups. However, a number of evangelical theologians, including Anglican John Stott, Church of Christ elder Edward Fudge, Open Theists Clark Pinnock and John Sanders, as well as Philip Edgecombe Hughes and others have offered support for the doctrine, touching off a heated debate within mainstream evangelical Christianity.

Since the 1960s, Annihilationism seems to be gaining as a legitimate minority opinion within modern, conservative Protestant theology. It has found support and acceptance among some British evangelicals, although viewed with greater suspicion by their American counterparts.

<http://www.theopedia.com/annihilationism>

"For the annihilationist, however, eternal punishment is seen as "permanent elimination."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 7:04 AM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Adamantine said:

Then I'd recommend not coming to a Tibetan Buddhist forum to denigrate the tradition.

Context is everything.

Malcolm wrote:

And suppose they do? Do you suppose that your are going to suddenly cause them to have a reconversion moment by placing more emphasis on the very thing that turned them off of to Vajrayāna to begin with?

Adamantine said:

Again, if they show up and make a post in the Tibetan Buddhist forum, and denigrate the tradition as a result of their misunderstanding, I will address it. I was hardly berating them however. As I said, context is essential here.

Malcolm wrote:

I didn't see any denigration.

Adamantine said:

(Jews don't have heaven or hell, so it is really the Christo-Islamic tradition of hells, rather than Judeo-Christian).

Actually, being part Jewish in heritage I think I know more about this than you. Never heard of Sheol? <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sheol> or Gehinnom / Gehenna?

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gehenna>

Malcolm wrote:

Neither really match the Christian idea of Hades.

Adamantine said:

Wrong again. It's explicitly a reference for God's wrath and punishment in both the Old and New Testaments.

Malcolm wrote:

In ancient Jewish belief, the dead were consigned to Sheol, a place to which all were sent indiscriminately (cf. Genesis 37:35; Numbers 16:30-33; Psalm 86:13; Ecclesiastes 9:10). Sheol was thought of as a place situated below the ground (cf. Ezek. 31:15), a place of darkness, silence and forgetfulness (cf. Job 10:21).[4] By the third to second century BC, the idea had grown to encompass separate divisions in sheol for the righteous and wicked (cf. the Book of Enoch),[5] and by the time of Jesus, some Jews had come to believe that those in Sheol awaited the resurrection of the dead either in comfort (in the bosom of Abraham) or in torment.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christian_views_on_hell

Doesn't sound like a place where one is consigned because of God's wrath to me.

Adamantine said:

Now I wonder when, if ever, Malcolm might admit he is wrong? I don't think I've yet to see it happen!

Malcolm wrote:

Why admit that which is false? If I am wrong, I will always admit it.

Adamantine said:

I certainly never implied that switching practice traditions would send one to hell. That's an incorrect projected inference that is not present in any of my posts. All I stated, (and still do) is that there are respectful ways to do so, and disrespectful ways to do so.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually you confirmed for Yogavajra that he did not understand the profound nature of dependent origination in Vajrayāna, etc, which is inclusive of understanding that if you break samaya, you are going to lower realms. Its all there in your post.

Adamantine said:

The types of posts recently made by the OP appear blatantly disrespectful to the Tibetan Buddhist tradition which so happens to be the tradition of this subforum.

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, I don't see this disrespect.

Adamantine said:

All that said, I actually don't believe they did indeed spend 20 years sincerely practicing HYT, as another member has already disputed.

Malcolm wrote:

Because when all is said and done, Dharmawheel members are certainly have developed to clairvoyance to peer into the minds of others.

Adamantine said:

I am presuming nothing more than a troll...

Malcolm wrote:

Then you presume wrong, he is a person working with his own limitations, just as you and I are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 5:45 AM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I just think you are busting someones balls/nads unnecessarily.

Adamantine said:

A bit humorous, btw coming from someone that is so prolific at ball-busting.

Malcolm wrote:

We all have to be good at something.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 5:44 AM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I just think you are busting someones balls/nads unnecessarily. When they tell you they are put off by all the fire and brimstone stuff connected with samaya, then that is enough. No need to go further. You can also point out that breaking the vow of not killing with serious intent results in eons of Avici Hell too, but I never see people mention this, it is always Vajrayāna people getting heavy with samaya vows.

Adamantine said:

I was merely pointing out that breaking samayas and not repairing them can escalate one's confusion and hinder one's understanding and realization, since it is considered a lifeline to realization.

Malcolm wrote:

And if you don't agree with the basic premise of this statement? Then?

Adamantine said:

This is common understanding, and hardly ball busting to bring up with anyone who has professed two decades of immersion in samaya commitments, and yet who doesn't appear to understand the very basics of Vajrayana methods (to the point of actively denigrating them on a Vajrayana subforum).

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps they found they do not agree with the basic concepts underlying Varjayāna at all. Then what do you do? Continue to berate them with their "lack of understanding?"

Adamantine said:

I never mentioned hells, that's something introduced by the OP and now you.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, he introduced them, and you used that as a reason to further berate to poor guy, invoking the Judeo-Christian eternalism to boot, inaccurately in fact, since the actual Christian doctrine about Hell is not fire and brimstone (That is a Buddho-Islamic trip, actually), but rather, total annihilation of the soul.

Adamantine said:

I only addressed hells directly in response to you, and to point out that they are equally prominent in all vehicles of Buddhadharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, of course they are. But I doubt deciding to switch practice traditions will land you in them. Killing puppies on the other hand, surely will.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Adamantine said:

To conflate a dualistic Judeo-Christian paradigm with something as profound as Vajrayana Dharma implies that you may not have grasped it's most basic principles.

Malcolm wrote:

He is doing nothing of the kind. In many places, the result of breaking samaya is described as a swift path to Vajra hell (Avici hell).

That is pretty fire and brimstone.

Adamantine said:

Except that hells from a Dharma view are a) not considered ultimately real, merely relative appearances corresponding to our relative negative accumulations and b) impermanent as opposed to the eternal Hell of Judeo-Christian traditions which is what "fire and brimstone" is conventionally associated with.

Malcolm wrote:

Uhhhh... my friend, incalculable eons in Avici hell feels pretty damn "eternal" to me from where I sit... And our fire and brimstone makes Christian fire and brimstone look tepid (Jews don't have heaven or hell, so it is really the Christo-Islamic tradition of hells, rather than Judeo-Christian).

Adamantine said:

So from our traditions POV the lower realms are akin to nightmares from which one will certainly awaken sooner or later. Hells are equally prominent in all expressions of Dharma, since the 6 realms and rebirth are quintessential aspects of understanding cyclic existence and the path beyond it. In the Sutra paths of Mahayana (which he is championing from the Zen or Ch'an side) there are endless accounts of hells, and a bodhisattva's presupposed willingness to endure them in order to benefit beings (as

evidenced in more than a few of the stories of Shakyamuni's previous lives).

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, endless accounts of hell.... more fire and brimstone...frankly, bodhisattvas don't spend much time in hells because there is not much they can do for anyone in them. It is the case that bodhisattvas do things that risk hells — but they only experience these very briefly, singed if you will, as in the bodhisattva as sea captain story we are all acquainted with.

Adamantine said:

I know that you know all this well, probably better than I do, but for whatever reason you've decided to be the Devil's advocate today. (No pun intended)

Malcolm wrote:

I just think you are busting someones balls/nads unnecessarily. When they tell you they are put off by all the fire and brimstone stuff connected with samaya, then that is enough. No need to go further. You can also point out that breaking the vow of not killing with serious intent results in eons of Avici Hell too, but I never see people mention this, it is always Vajrayāna people getting heavy with samaya vows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Adamantine said:

To conflate a dualistic Judeo-Christian paradigm with something as profound as Vajrayana Dharma implies that you may not have grasped it's most basic principles.

Malcolm wrote:

He is doing nothing of the kind. In many places, the result of breaking samaya is described as a swift path to Vajra hell (Avici hell).

That is pretty fire and brimstone. Rather than patronizing the guy, you could try and hear him, and set aside your Vajrayāna privilege.

#Zenlivesmatter

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 20th, 2016 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism

Content:

seeker242 said:

Not drawing any lines would result in this situation.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 19th, 2016 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: plan to change temple symbol on maps

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, it grew out of the founding of Charleston, South Carolina by Barbados slavers and their style of plantation agriculture which spread rapidly in the South, as opposed to the restorative agriculture practiced in the Mid Atlantic states on up. It had very little to do with climate, per se.

Taco_Rice said:

When those slavers popped out of the vacuum, fell from the inky heavens and emerged from their black calyxes, I'm sure they were opposed every step of the way. Anyway, what does this have to do with respectfully acknowledging biological differences between human beings...?

Malcolm wrote:

IN fact, if you have studied the history of agriculture in the US, there was in fact a rather vocal discussion in the agricultural community about such things as the differences between plantation style agriculture with its increasing inefficiencies as opposed to restorative agriculture which was developed on the basis of New England States like Vermont trashing their ecologies. See *Larding the Lean Earth: Soil and Society in Nineteenth Century America* by Steven Stoll. In particular it details important conversations farmers were having South Carolina as well as Pennsylvania, and the kinds of choices they made and why, based on rural publications of the day where they discussed these issues.

M

Taco_Rice said:

Read *American Nations: A History of the Eleven Rival Regional Cultures of North America*

I'll check this out. This what the reviews say, though:

Malcolm wrote:

Much of his ideas are based on another book, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* by David Hackett Fischer, which discusses four main groups of English Settlers, Puritans, Cavaliers, Quakers, and Scots-Irish in Appalachia, and and their impact on everything that forms American culture today

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 19th, 2016 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: plan to change temple symbol on maps

Content:

Taco_Rice said:

I think we could just as easily attribute the conflict to more fundamental differences in the cultures of the regions that are deeply rooted in the histories of the people who settled (and were, uh, imported,) there as well as geography and climate. Toynbee identified the North and South as two distinct streams of civilization operating under the same banner, and it's apparent, even today, that the end of the civil war did not perfectly reconcile the North and South. The differences in culture, that is, in ideology, which sprang largely from the differences in respective economies, which arose from the differences in the cold climate of the industrialized North and the warm climate of the agricultural South are a more fundamental cause for the conflict, in my view. There is, after all, no reason for a government to worry about rebellion from people who are loyal to them or for rebellion against a government which one believes is "fulfilling the mandate of heaven," however one chooses to posit such a mandate as existing.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it grew out of the founding of Charleston, South Carolina by Barbados slavers and their style of plantation agriculture which spread rapidly in the South, as opposed to the restorative agriculture practiced in the Mid Atlantic states on up. It had very little to do with climate, per se.

Read American Nations: A History of the Eleven Rival Regional Cultures of North America

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 19th, 2016 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In any case, in Dzogchen, one just unifies all samaya in guru yoga and that is sufficient.

Adamantine said:

This was a dialogue with a Gelug HYT practitioner, not an Ati yogi.

Malcolm wrote:

You are a Dzogchen practitioner. You don't follow the Hinayanistic interpretation of samaya found in Sarma, do you? If so, why relate to it from their point of view and try to condition someone else?

From my perspective he has not broken any samaya since he has maintained his commitment to liberation, which is the essential "samaya" in which all other relative samayas are contained.

Samaya shaming practitioners for any reason is stupid.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 19th, 2016 at 2:16 AM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Samaya is like any other vow. It is a sustained intention. When one changes one's intention, that stream is interrupted.

Mother's Lap said:

So a monk that breaks his vow by having sex is still a (faulty) monk due to rupa vows, but when he no longer thinks of himself a monk his rupa vows disappear?

Malcolm wrote:

No, in this case a parajika is still a parajika. Vows are a social contract. When you take the monastic vows, you are essentially agreeing that if you commit the four defeats, you are defeated. Therefore, having decided to commit a defeat, that monastic vow of refraining from sexual misconduct is permanently broken and you lose your status as a monastic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 19th, 2016 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Sadhana Practice

Content:

ngodrup said:

For Dzogchnpas, the deity is the nature of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

But, as Khyentse Wangpo quipped to Mipham, it also does not have rosy pink cheeks.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 19th, 2016 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Adamantine said:

Especially since in Gelug HYT the vows and commitments are quite strict and binding for life...

Malcolm wrote:

Funny how something which is supposed to liberate is described as binding...

Anyway, it is not our job to condition others. Samaya is not some invisible force. Samaya is simply an agreement. If you don't want that agreement anymore, it is dissolved.

Adamantine said:

I don't believe it's so simple and black and white as that when even with the most worldly samsaric commitment-agreement (samaya) it would require more than simply not wanting it anymore to remove oneself from it. For example it would be extremely disrespectful of me to just leave my wife without a word, would cause her pain, the lack of consideration would cause karmic kick-back, not to mention certain legal troubles down the line. Similarly, if I pledged my loyalty to my country and joined the armed forces I couldn't just go AWOL without assuming consequences. There are respectful ways to go about removing oneself from a commitment, and there are disrespectful ways. The former will cause less negative repercussions than the latter.

Malcolm wrote:

Samaya is like any other vow. It is a sustained intention. When one changes one's intention, that stream is interrupted.

In any case, in Dzogchen, one just unifies all samaya in guru yoga and that is sufficient.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 18th, 2016 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: How long do you meditate for?

Content:

Adamantine said:

Especially since in Gelug HYT the vows and commitments are quite strict and binding for life...

Malcolm wrote:

Funny how something which is supposed to liberate is described as binding...

Anyway, it is not our job to condition others. Samaya is not some invisible force. Samaya is simply an agreement. If you don't want that agreement anymore, it is dissolved.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 18th, 2016 at 10:25 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Killer Mike's Morehouse speech, one of the most important speeches of the 2016 campaign:

```
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: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 18th, 2016 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: What are the biggest obstacles faced by 'western' Buddhi

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Maybe Simon is onto something with this prapañca thing.

Malcolm wrote:

Prapañca is prapañca, whether Asian or Western, ancient or modern.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I wasn't being entirely serious.

Malcolm wrote:

Goes without saying...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 18th, 2016 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: What are the biggest obstacles faced by 'western' Buddhi

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Maybe Simon is onto something with this prapañca thing.

Malcolm wrote:

Prapañca is prapañca, whether Asian or Western, ancient or modern.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 17th, 2016 at 10:31 PM

Title: Re: What are the biggest obstacles faced by 'western' Buddhi

Content:

Simon E. said:

You would keep your stake...

Malcolm wrote:

I am just saying the when it comes to collecting empowerments, for example, Tibetans have knocked it out of the ballpark. We can't compete.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 17th, 2016 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: What are the biggest obstacles faced by 'western' Buddhi

Content:

Simon E. said:

Perhaps Malcolm, traditional Dharmic cultures (should any remain) value prapanca less.

And perhaps they have fewer means of broadcasting their wang collection.

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Simon,

You would not know it by the sheer logorrhea of Tibetan scholastics. And, exactly how many westerners do you know who have received The Rinchen Terzo, Kagyu Ngagzo, Damngag Dzo, Gyud de kun su, etc.?

Not many I wager.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 17th, 2016 at 8:44 PM

Title: Re: What are the biggest obstacles faced by 'western' Buddhi

Content:

Simon E. said:

By western I would include those whose education has largely followed a western-led curriculum.

I would suggest two main ones.

Prapanca..we have been conditioned to see all mental speculation and proliferation of ideas as in themselves good and positive, and in the context of Liberation from the round of birth and death this might not be so..

And the other is associated with the first..

Collecting. Collecting teachings and teachers and empowerments and skillful means that we then store and do not use except to display them like trophies or pinned butterflies.

These are not original thoughts.

CTR early in his teaching career identified these two factors as the parents of Spiritual Materialism.

Malcolm wrote:

Prapañca is a disease which affects all ordinary sentient beings equally.

Tibetans "collect" many more empowerments than Westerners do, in fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 17th, 2016 at 7:26 AM

Title: Re: Oral Transmission of the Sutra of Golden Light

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

With all due respect to Lama Zopa, you cannot receive a lung from a recording. For example, you cannot turn on a lamp unless it is plugged into a wall, likewise, you cannot receive transmission from a recording.

Anyway, it is a sūtra, you don't need any special transmission for it.

Manjushri Fan said:

That is a very useful analogy and I do understand what you mean.

Yes as it is sūtra you do not need transmission but I find just listening to the teaching can focus my mind, which will have karmaic benefits along the line somewhere as my practice has improved

Malcolm wrote:

I never said it wasn't beneficial to listen to recordings of people chanting sūtras. I merely maintaining that the idea one can receive transmission from a recording is mistaken.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 17th, 2016 at 6:59 AM

Title: Re: Oral Transmission of the Sutra of Golden Light

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a lung because it isn't live.

Manjushri Fan said:

Malcolm: As it's late in the UK so my question may seem offensive, I mean no disrespect because I know you are very knowledgeable about Tibetan Buddhism and I value your input on any question I have.

But, does this not fall down to views on whether a lung must be live, seen as Lama Zopa says: Lama Zopa Rinpoche agreed to allow those who listen to a recording of Rinpoche giving the oral transmission to receive the transmission in full. You may receive this oral transmission by watching/listening to the video provided here or the audio linked to below. You must listen to the entire sutra in order to receive the full transmission from Lama Zopa Rinpoche.

Malcolm wrote:

With all due respect to Lama Zopa, you cannot receive a lung from a recording. For example, you cannot turn on a lamp unless it is plugged into a wall, likewise, you cannot receive transmission from a recording.

Anyway, it is a sūtra, you don't need any special transmission for it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 17th, 2016 at 6:48 AM

Title: Re: Oral Transmission of the Sutra of Golden Light

Content:

Manjushri Fan said:

I've just watched this and I feel so much better for it.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a lung because it isn't live.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 17th, 2016 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

Someone has sold you some fairytales Kevin.

Malcolm wrote:

Regardless, the skeleton of the ACA was actually designed by conservatives connected with the Heritage Foundation with the aim of making health insurance more profitable for insurance companies.

In short, Obamacare is great for people in some states who make the poverty level or less, but it unduly punishes middle class families and is a form of excessive taxation with little or no benefits. There are millions of people out there who are paying \$10,000 a year with \$6,000 deductibles.

In short, health care and education are rights and not privileges.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 15th, 2016 at 12:18 PM

Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Not to get too tirthika-ish, but here's something from Suri Nagamma's "Letters from Sri Ramanasramam": When Bhagavan was in Virupaksha Cave, Echamma, who installed a picture of Bhagavan and a picture of Seshadri Swami in her house, decided to do puja with a lakh of tender leaves, and began it after informing Bhagavan about it. By the time she had finished the puja with fifty thousand leaves, summer had set in, and she could not gather any more leaves even though she wandered all over the mountain. She got tired, and went to Bhagavan to ventilate her grievances. Bhagavan said, "If you cannot get the leaves, why not pinch yourself and do puja?" She said, "Oh, but that will be painful!" Bhagavan said, "If it pains you to pinch your body, is it not painful to the tree when you cut its leaves?" She turned pale and asked, "Why did you not tell me earlier, Swami?" He replied, "When you know that pinching the body is painful, why did you not

know that the tree will be equally pained if you rob it of its leaves? Do I have to tell you that?"

(Bhagavan = Ramana Maharshi)

Malcolm wrote:
Common sense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 15th, 2016 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism

Content:

Sonam Wangchug said:

One of my Guru's has said that if we are to cut down a tree, because the tree may be inhabited by a spirit.

That being if you cut the tree will feel pain due to their association and attachment with it.

Malcolm wrote:
Sounds like mind/body to me...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 14th, 2016 at 6:36 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Scalia died, things are going to get really interesting now!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 14th, 2016 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

My point of view is, if it breathes, if it uses prāṇa vāyu, it is sentient.

Mother's Lap said:
What about fire?

Malcolm wrote:
Fire does not use prāṇa vāyu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 14th, 2016 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I think the dividing line between sentient and nonsentient is a great deal more porous than Buddhists would like to acknowledge.

dzogchungpa said:

You're not going panpsychist on us, are you?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, I just think that drawing a hard line between sentient and nonsentient life is very difficult, if not impossible. That hard line cannot bear any rigorous examination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 13th, 2016 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that plants are not sentient is a cultural idea, it is not a hard doctrinal Buddhist position.

My point of view is, if it breathes, if it uses prāṇa vāyu, it is sentient.

I have come to the conclusion there is no such thing as nonsentient life.

kirtu said:

OK, so you can accept various Hindu, Jain (I think), Taoist, and shamanistic views regarding sentience (all of which *can* hold that all life is sentient - not that they always do hold that view though).

dzogchungpa said:

So, do you hold that, for example, humans can be reborn as trees and vice versa?

Malcom said:

Hell, according to the Jatakas, one can be reborn as a bridge or a broom.

kirtu said:

Unless you can provide a quote I'll have to point out that this is an incorrect reading of the Jatakas. Sentient beings can be reborn as beings (usually spirits or dewas or ghosts of some sort) that use the objects as homes. Sometimes they are essentially imprisoned in those objects (like the Mahasiddha whose mother was reborn as an insect inside of a rock that was used as a hearthstone). This, BTW, is a common shamanistic view (although there can be variations from culture to culture). Many people who grew up in Hawaii, for example, would be comfortable at least with the idea that beings inhabit plants, rocks, mountains, ocean, etc. even if they were uncomfortable articulating that in a wider, esp. Western, cultural context). However this

view is also acknowledged variously among American Indian groups as well. And this is also the general Tibetan view.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Kirt:

Again, the story you cite is a cultural misunderstanding of fossilization. Tibetans, as well as most other humans, did not understand that creatures they found in rock were born millions of years of ago, died, and settled to floor of an ancient ocean -- nevertheless, rock formations where trilobites are found are used in Tibetan medicine.

I think the dividing line between sentient and nonsentient is a great deal more porous than Buddhists would like to acknowledge.

Then there is the case of earthworm. If you cut an earthworm in half, clearly both sides live on, and indeed will form individuals. Are earthworms sentient or not? If they are, how does their individual sentience arise in absence of conception?

Perhaps it is the case that Buddhadharma does not account for everything in the Universe, as much as we would like.

As far as the broom and bridge stories go, they can be found in the Petavatthu. There are a number of examples where monks and so on are born as inanimate objects, pillars, brooms, etc.

The container/content metaphor (mind/body, spirit/tree, etc.) is a powerful metaphor, but that is all it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 13th, 2016 at 10:28 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

IMO it is time for people to take the risk, and actually be more politically mobilized.

Malcolm wrote:

Bernie or bust.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 13th, 2016 at 9:51 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Norwegian said:

What is Hillary Clinton part of? The establishment. Once more, for repetition: The establishment. Why would you vote for this?

Kim O'Hara said:

Only to keep Cruz or Trump as far from the White House as possible.

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

That's the point, Kim. Clinton can't keep Trump out. Have you seen the polls?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 13th, 2016 at 9:40 AM

Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Are you insinuating that some traditional points of view are mistaken?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, when did I ever say otherwise?

dzogchungpa said:

OK, just checking.

Malcolm wrote:

The idea that plants are not sentient is a cultural idea, it is not a hard doctrinal Buddhist position.

My point of view is, if it breathes, if it uses prāṇa vāyu, it is sentient.

I have come to the conclusion there is no such thing as nonsentient life.

But hey, that's just me.

dzogchungpa said:

So, do you hold that, for example, humans can be reborn as trees and vice versa?

Malcolm wrote:

Hell, according to the Jatakas, one can be reborn as a bridge or a broom.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 13th, 2016 at 8:11 AM

Title: Re: Repairing the damage from fake tantra

Content:

spiritualtrainwreck said:

Hi, everyone. I'm new here and I have a question to pose to you all.

In 2014, I received practices from someone who attended empowerments from a legitimate lama in bad faith. The manner in which they were in bad faith is restricted in the TOS, so it will have to suffice to say that they did not actually receive the empowerments and definitely weren't qualified to give them to me.

I stopped practicing these teachings and cut off contact with the person that gave me them after it became clear they were using the student teacher relationship to abuse and exploit people for an unrelated agenda they were paid for.

Now I want to really receive the tantric teachings and practice them, but I feel spiritually dirty and I know what I was taught was not tantra and was psychologically destructive and encouraged me to be self righteously malicious towards people that got in my way (divine rage) and lie.

How can I clean out my mind of these wrong ideas and make a pure relationship with the Buddha's teachings?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, one thing, you are not at fault in any way. So you are not tainted.

Find a qualified master, and continue on your way. It is never too late.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 13th, 2016 at 7:55 AM

Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

However the point is that from at least one traditional Buddhist perspective trees and plants are not sentient.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, that is a traditional point of view. So is the idea that woman have an inferior birth.

dzogchungpa said:

Are you insinuating that some traditional points of view are mistaken?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, when did I ever say otherwise?

The idea that plants are not sentient is a cultural idea, it is not a hard doctrinal Buddhist position.

My point of view is, if it breathes, if it uses prāṇa vāyu, it is sentient.

I have come to the conclusion there is no such thing as nonsentient life.

But hey, that's just me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 13th, 2016 at 7:49 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

1) Clinton is unelectable. But you would have to live here to understand this.

kirtu said:

Many people who identify as mainstream Democrats disagree with you. Some friends of mine have taken pains to present their view that "Sanders is unelectable" (in their view of course, not mine).

Malcolm wrote:

Establishment Dems did not elect Obama in either election.

Those who elected Obama in 2008 already voted on their opinion of Clinton, that is why she did not take the 2008 nomination.

The only reason she is running is because her arrogance and egotism knows no bounds, and she really does not care about anything other than being the first female president. She feels we "owe" it to her.

If the Democratic Party wants my vote, the votes of millions like me, and a win in 2016, they damn well better nominate Bernie. I am not voting for Hillary Clinton and neither are they. That is a guarantee.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 13th, 2016 at 7:39 AM

Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism

Content:

kirtu said:

However the point is that from at least one traditional Buddhist perspective trees and plants are not sentient.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, that is a traditional point of view. So is the idea that woman have an inferior birth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 13th, 2016 at 7:06 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Clinton represents the one percent, and she speaks glowingly of mass murderers. The latter point alone should bar anyone with a Buddhist conscience from voting for her. Voting for Clinton is a step backward, not a step forward.

Kim O'Hara said:

Agreed, except that IMO she is a less-bad candidate than any of the Republicans. I'm with Jeff (well, I would be if I were American): "I will vote for Hilary if she gets it, but I want to vote for Bernie," and " 1) the only thing worse than casting a relatively meaningless vote is not voting at all – because then the worst politicians really win; and 2) I want to be part of a bigger voice that supports what I consider to be government-for-people."

Malcolm wrote:

1) Clinton is unelectable. But you would have to live here to understand this.

2) More importantly, a vote for the neoliberal 1% oligarchy, represented by the Establishment Dems and the Republicans, is precisely throwing away a vote. It is a vote for business as usual. You, of all people, should understand this.

But there are other options. There is writing Bernie Sanders in or voting Green in the general election.

There is considerable fear mongering by the Establishment Dems, but people here — especially young people — are not being swayed by it this time.

If you really look into these issues, you will really understand why Clinton is not a choice. We are tired of voting for corporate candidates.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 13th, 2016 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Jeff H said:

I will vote for Hilary if she gets it, but I want to vote for Bernie. I don't know what he could or could not do about policy, but I like that he is saying no politician can do it alone. He says we need a popular uprising to affect any meaningful change in government. Unfortunately, that's what the Tea Party has been trying to do for years from the other

side and I disagree with their ends and their methods.

Malcolm wrote:

Tea party has been very effective — they understand that it is about getting people in the senate and house. Likewise, the Sanders revolution is about getting people involved in their own political life. Everything Sanders is suggesting is doable if people maintain their engagement in the process. This how civil rights was won. Taking the house and the senate is step one.

Clinton represents the one percent, and she speaks glowingly of mass murderers. The latter point alone should bar anyone with a Buddhist conscience from voting for her. Voting for Clinton is a step backward, not a step forward.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 12th, 2016 at 7:07 AM

Title: Re: Does Karma explain everything.

Content:

Punya said:

The essence of prajñā is the ability to discriminate, that's all.

Ok, I was thinking of it as untainted wisdom, so that helps.

(Edit: Actually, now I think about it, I have heard/seen prajna described as discriminating awareness but clearly hadn't thought about it deeply enough to understand what that actually meant.)

There are two kinds of prajñā, contaminated prajñā and uncontaminated prajñā; only āryas possess the latter.

So in talking about contaminated prajna, in what sense are you saying that it is neutral?

Malcolm wrote:

All phenomena are contaminated apart from path dharmas. So when we say there are ten neutral mental factors, we do not mean they are uncontaminated, we mean they do not belong the group of ten positive mental factors, the six negative mental factors, the fourteen afflicted mental factors and so on.

Prajñā is one of the ten neutral mental factors.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 12th, 2016 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Does Karma explain everything.

Content:

Punya said:

Thank you for the very insightful discussion Anjali and Malcolm.

I don't understand this last comment Malcolm. I think of prajna as untainted. Is the defiled person who decides to make the bomb misapprehending wisdom? I would have

thought the wisdom would simply be obscured ie they couldn't access it.

Malcolm wrote:

There are two kinds of prajñā, contaminated prajñā and uncontaminated prajñā; only āryas possess the latter.

The essence of prajñā is the ability to discriminate, that's all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 12th, 2016 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Who says trees are not sentient?

Taco_Rice said:

Heartless vegans, probably.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 12th, 2016 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Chopping down trees and Buddhism

Content:

Nosta said:

Even if you dont believe in the existence of spirits inside trees, since a tree is a living (but not sentient) being, shouldnt be respected?

Malcolm wrote:

Who says trees are not sentient?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 11th, 2016 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: Does Karma explain everything.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if a defiled mind happens to select the path, it gradually "sobers" up and uses a shampoo [the path] to rid of the crabs. Otherwise, it just keeps getting the crabs, worse and worse.

BTW, another mental factor that is neutral is prajñā, in a defiled person, this again can be used to decide to follow the path, or, become really really good at making bombs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 11th, 2016 at 11:29 AM

Title: Re: Does Karma explain everything.

Content:

anjali said:

In your example above, the drinker had at least two alternatives: to get drunk or not. The "get drunk" option was somehow selected to become an intentional action. That's why I originally brought up the notion of a gap between desires and intentions. There seems to be another factor, or step, in play. After all, how many of us have been faced with the dilemma of which course of action to take? Intention per se doesn't seem to help with resolving the dilemma. Intention seems to happen upon resolving the dilemma.

Do Buddhists recognize a mental factor that generates possibilities and (perhaps another mental factor that) then picks/decides/down-selects one to become intentional?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, if a defiled mind happens to select the path, it gradually "sobers" up and uses a shampoo [the path] to rid of the crabs. Otherwise, it just keeps getting the crabs, worse and worse.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 11th, 2016 at 6:47 AM

Title: Re: Does Karma explain everything.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no gap between desire and intention, per se. Cetana is a mental factor that all minds possess.

anjali said:

Let's look at an example: I'd like a slice of pecan pie that's in the fridge, and then I decide, yes, I will have that slice, then get up and go get it. I think it's clear that the desire for pie is not the same as the intention to get the pie, but there are a couple of ways of looking at this example.

1. Would it be correct to say cetana is the mental factor that takes the raw material of desires and transforms them into intentions? My desire for pie has been transformed into my intention for pie.
2. Or is it that cetana takes desires and constructs intentions that are tightly correlated with the desires (intentions and desires are completely different, but bound together)? My desire for pie is bound to, but different from, my new intention to get the pie.
3. Some other relationship?

Malcolm wrote:

Desire is a poison. The cetana itself is neither afflicted or nonafflicted by nature, it is neutral. When a cetana is afflicted it is poisoned; therefore, that cetana tends to

towards afflicted objects as well. Think of it this way: you are sober, and you see a very unattractive person you would never sleep with. Later, you get drunk (affliction), and in the morning you find yourself in bed with that very same person you never would have slept with in a million years (karma). Only now you have crabs (suffering). This is affliction --> action --> suffering.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 11th, 2016 at 6:08 AM

Title: Re: Does the World Vanish?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Thanks for your reply, Malcolm!

Malcolm wrote:

From the same text...

tomamundsen said:

Which text is that?

Malcolm wrote:

100 Gates of Samadhi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 11th, 2016 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Does the World Vanish?

Content:

Matt J said:

So I was reading "Rainbow Body and Resurrection" by Father Tiso and came across a passage in which he says that based on his sources, the rainbow body is simply the dissolving the appearance of the body due to the strength of the realization of the yogi--- it is not actually the dissolving of matter.

Malcolm wrote:

Rainbow body is the actual reversion of the matter of the physical body into pristine consciousness (ye shes). As Shabkar says:

As such, after the material atoms dissolve, one manifests as light [...]

Though in trekchö, the subtle atoms

and mind dissolve into the state of reality,

it is nothing other than mere liberation into the state of original purity.

2) Does the illusory universe disappear for the realized Dzogchenpa? If so, how is that different from cessation? If not, what the teaching?[/quote]

From the same text:

The way that great transference body arises:
when all the visions have gradually been exhausted,
when one focuses one's awareness on the appearances strewn about
on the luminous maṇḍala of the five fingers of one's hand,
the environment and inhabitants of the universe
returning from that appearance are perceived as like moon in the water.
One's body is just a reflection,
self-apparent as the illusory body of pristine consciousness;
externally and internally pellucid; free from being harmed by the four elements;
one obtains a vajra-like body.
One sees one's body as transparent inside and out.
The impure eyes of others cannot see one's body as transparent,
but only the body as it was before;
for example, when the hand of Mutri Tsaṅpo touched
the body of Master Padmasambhava,
according to account of their meeting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 11th, 2016 at 5:27 AM

Title: Re: Does Karma explain everything.

Content:

anjali said:

For sentient beings, what determines a specific intention arising at a specific time?
Karma?

Malcolm wrote:

As for your second question, karma does not create karma. Affliction creates karma. In order for there to be a karma, there has to be an afflicted mind, an object, and either attachment or aversion to that object. When an intention about a given object arises, that intention itself is karma. For example, if you see an enemy, that perception of an enemy itself is afflicted. The intention to harm that enemy is itself karma. Following that, there is derived karma, i.e. the physical actions of body and voice that ensue in trying to kill that enemy.

anjali said:

Ok. I was able to find this quote from the Nibbedhika Sutta, Anguttara Nikaya 6.63:
Intention (cetana) I tell you, is kamma. Intending, one does kamma by way of body, speech, & intellect.

To express all this in a different way, to see if I understand it, the flow would go like this: I want to harm someone (as a result of aversion)--desires per se are not karma
I will harm someone (move from desire to intention)--this is intention (karma)
I am harming someone (move from intention to action)--this is derived karma.
What interests me is the gap between desire and intention. Obviously given the definition of karma, karma can not explain how the gap is bridged between desire and

intention. In our day to day lives, we experience desires becoming intentions, but on close inspection, it's not actually clear how a want becomes a will. To what extent, if any, does cause and effect actually come into play in bridging that gap?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no gap between desire and intention, per se. Cetana is a mental factor that all minds possess. Afflicted minds just have afflicted cetanas. Those afflicted cetanas are karma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 10th, 2016 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

Lukeinaz said:

If form is empty it must be empty of something.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, a form (an object of the eye) is empty of an essence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 10th, 2016 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: Does Karma explain everything.

Content:

anjali said:

One without dualistic ignorance (a Buddha) acts without intention and spontaneously?

For sentient beings, what determines a specific intention arising at a specific time?

Karma?

Malcolm wrote:

As for your first question, yes, a Buddha acts free of intention, spontaneously.

As for your second question, karma does not create karma. Affliction creates karma. In order for there to be a karma, there has to be an afflicted mind, an object, and either attachment or aversion to that object. When an intention about a given object arises, that intention itself is karma. For example, if you see an enemy, that perception of an enemy itself is afflicted. The intention to harm that enemy is itself karma. Following that, there is derived karma, i.e. the physical actions of body and voice that ensue in trying to kill that enemy.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 10th, 2016 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: recommended Dzogchen retreats/courses/teachers

Content:

Karma_Yeshe said:

Also, even if some people like to claim otherwise, there is no such thing as "the greatest master alive"

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, in point of fact there is. Chogyal Namkhai Norbu has done more to promulgate Dzogchen teachings than any other living master. Who else teaches Sems sde, klong sde, man ngag sde, etc. in their complete form, not merely as theories, but as practices? Can you name anyone? No? I didn't think so.

So, while it is true a star, the moon and the sun are all the same in that they illuminate the Earth from the sky, there is a difference in their power to illuminate.

For example, there have been many Dzogchen masters in Tibetan History, but no one would argue that Longchen Rabjam wasn't the greatest Tibetan Dzogchen master in History.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 10th, 2016 at 1:00 PM

Title: Re: What is the objective of Mahayana Buddhist practice?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

There is room in the Mahayana for all of us, of many stripes, respecting and honoring each other...

Malcolm wrote:

The point, seemingly lost on you, is that some people are feeling disrespected by you and what you write

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 10th, 2016 at 11:46 AM

Title: Re: What is the objective of Mahayana Buddhist practice?

Content:

Wayfarer said:

That is exactly why, in the recent discussions we were having about śūnyatā, that I was saying that 'śūnyatā doesn't mean non-existent'.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, it means "absence" or "void."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 10th, 2016 at 10:26 AM

Title: Re: What is the objective of Mahayana Buddhist practice?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

especially given that you are a teacher, your behavior here is very ugly.

Malcolm wrote:

He is not your teacher, so, his opinions are of no consequence.

Johnny Dangerous said:

That's true, I simply find it ugly behavior for someone who claims to teach Dharma to act that way on a public forum.

Malcolm wrote:

Does he teach Dharma? Who knows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 10th, 2016 at 10:14 AM

Title: Re: What is the objective of Mahayana Buddhist practice?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

especially given that you are a teacher, your behavior here is very ugly.

Malcolm wrote:

He is not your teacher, so, his opinions are of no consequence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 10th, 2016 at 8:49 AM

Title: Re: Does Karma explain everything.

Content:

krodha said:

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.

anjali said:

Something I've occasionally wondered is, how does intention arise? Is it uncaused and spontaneous?

Malcolm wrote:

It is conditioned by suffering and is afflicted by nature, since it arises from dualistic ignorance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 10th, 2016 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: plan to change temple symbol on maps

Content:

Manjushri Fan said:

I remeber reading this, I can see why people want to change it but I believe it should stay the same, we should change all Buddhist, Jain and Hindu cultures because it symbolises hate in Europe

Malcolm wrote:

I am sorry, but this is just to PC. We Buddhists should not feel the need to eliminate the swastika from our temples and statues. This is crazy.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 10th, 2016 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: What is the objective of Mahayana Buddhist practice?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[cue endless discursive jundo-babble]

jundo cohen said:

It is only bad when people begin believing that what may perhaps be untrue is true. It is even worse when people go beyond believing to insisting and teaching that the untrue is true and that anyone who does not believe so is wrong and should be banished (or sometimes in this world burned or bombed).

Many of the serious debates and explanations that arise in a religion forum such as this one that are taken as serious inquiry into reality may be no more solid than asking why Kryptonite works on Superman. It is my feeling that, if a newcomer asks "What is the objective of Mahayana Buddhist practice?", we should avoid to teach them from the outset anything which smacks of the Buddhist equivalent of Metropolis and X-ray vision, except perhaps as parable or symbolic myth.

(Of course, on what is fact and what is fiction, views will disagree and that is fine).

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:

[/cue endless discursive jundo-babble]

You never disappoint, Jundo.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 10th, 2016 at 1:45 AM

Title: Re: What is the objective of Mahayana Buddhist practice?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

...that one finds oneself in the realm of religion.

Malcolm wrote:

And that's bad because...?

[cue endless discursive jundo-babble]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 10th, 2016 at 1:19 AM

Title: Re: recommended Dzogchen retreats/courses/teachers

Content:

narraboth said:

After Kyabje Taklung tsetrul Rinpoche passed away, Kyabje Yangthang Rinpoche is probably the last older Tibetan lama who actively give transmission including Dzogchen teaching. Taklung Tsetrul Rinpoche used to visit europe every two years. Yangthang Rinpoche might visit europe again, or you can meet him in Sikkim (he gives audience every morning).

Of course, Kyabje Dodrupchen Rinpoche and Kyabje Sangye Tsering Rinpoche are still alive, but my understanding is that they don't openly give teaching anymore. Even meeting them is not easy.

There are several slightly younger nyingma masters also visit europe from time to time and giving Dzogchen teaching. Keep an eye on it.

Malcolm wrote:

Yangthang Rinpoche is a wonderful master.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 10th, 2016 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: What is the objective of Mahayana Buddhist practice?

Content:

Matt J said:

I think there's an interesting dialogue in Buddhism about views. All views are limited, but I don't think that means all views are equal. In Theravada, there is a teaching called transcendental dependent arising.

Malcolm wrote:

This also exists in Mahāyāna, even Dzogchen. It is often termed "reverse dependent origination."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 10th, 2016 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: recommended Dzogchen retreats/courses/teachers

Content:

lunak said:

Hi,

I would like to taste Dzogchen after reading of some books.

I already have experience with Vipassana meditation and retreats.

I am looking for:

retreats/courses: preferably in Europe, or Tibet, but can be US or other places if really valuable

teachers/masters: I know that picking good teacher is essential, that's why I would appreciate your recommendation/experiences

Thank you very much for help

Lukasz

Malcolm wrote:

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu is based in Europe. Greatest living Dzogchen master, bar none.
<https://dzogchen.net>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 9th, 2016 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Does Karma explain everything.

Content:

Jeff H said:

Your perspective is very interesting, Jayavara! It will take me a while to read your article and I anxiously await the response of the scholars here on DW. I think this is going to be a really good discussion, so while Malcolm does his warm-up exercises, I want to stick my two-cents worth in now.

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing more that needs to be said than what the Buddha says in the above sutta from the Majjhima Nikaya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 9th, 2016 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Does Karma explain everything.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I have heard that on one occasion the Blessed One was staying near Savatthi in Jeta's Grove, Anathapindika's monastery. Then Subha the student, Todeyya's son, went to the Blessed One and, on arrival, exchanged courteous greetings with him. After an exchange of friendly greetings & courtesies, he sat to one side. As he was sitting there, he said to the Blessed One: "Master Gotama, what is the reason, what is the cause, why baseness & excellence are seen among human beings, among the human race? For short-lived & long-lived people are to be seen, sickly & healthy, ugly & beautiful, uninfluential & influential, poor & rich, low-born & high-born, stupid & discerning people are to be seen. So what is the reason, what is the cause, why baseness & excellence are seen among human beings, among the human race?"

"Student, beings are owners of kamma, heir to kamma, born of kamma, related through kamma, and have kamma as their arbitrator. Kamma is what creates distinctions among beings in terms of coarseness & refinement."

"I don't understand the detailed meaning of Master Gotama's statement spoken in brief without explaining the detailed meaning. It would be good if Master Gotama taught me the Dhamma so that I might understand the detailed meaning of his brief statement."

"In that case, student, listen & pay close attention. I will speak."

"As you say, Master Gotama," Subha the student responded.

The Blessed One said: "There is the case, student, where a woman or man is a killer of living beings, brutal, bloody-handed, given to killing & slaying, showing no mercy to living beings. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in the plane of deprivation, the bad destination, the lower realms, hell. If, on the break-up of the body, after death — instead of reappearing in the plane of deprivation, the bad destination, the lower realms, hell — he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is short-lived wherever reborn. This is the way leading to a short life: to be a killer of living beings, brutal, bloody-handed, given to killing & slaying, showing no mercy to living beings.

"But then there is the case where a woman or man, having abandoned the killing of living beings, abstains from killing living beings, and dwells with the rod laid down, the knife laid down, scrupulous, merciful, & sympathetic for the welfare of all living beings. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in a good destination, in the heavenly world. If, on the break-up of the body, after death — instead of reappearing in a good destination, in the heavenly world — he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is long-lived wherever reborn. This is the way leading to a long life: to have abandoned the killing of living beings, to abstain from killing living beings, to dwell with one's rod laid down, one's knife laid down, scrupulous, merciful, & sympathetic for the welfare of all living beings.

"There is the case where a woman or man is one who harms beings with his/her fists, with clods, with sticks, or with knives. Through having adopted & carried out such

actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in the plane of deprivation... If instead he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is sickly wherever reborn. This is the way leading to sickness: to be one who harms beings with one's fists, with clods, with sticks, or with knives.

"But then there is the case where a woman or man is not one who harms beings with his/her fists, with clods, with sticks, or with knives. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in a good destination... If instead he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is healthy wherever reborn. This is the way leading to health: not to be one who harms beings with one's fists, with clods, with sticks, or with knives.

"There is the case, where a woman or man is ill-tempered & easily upset; even when lightly criticized, he/she grows offended, provoked, malicious, & resentful; shows annoyance, aversion, & bitterness. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in the plane of deprivation... If instead he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is ugly wherever reborn. This is the way leading to ugliness: to be ill-tempered & easily upset; even when lightly criticized, to grow offended, provoked, malicious, & resentful; to show annoyance, aversion, & bitterness.

"But then there is the case where a woman or man is not ill-tempered or easily upset; even when heavily criticized, he/she doesn't grow offended, provoked, malicious, or resentful; doesn't show annoyance, aversion, or bitterness. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in a good destination... If instead he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is beautiful wherever reborn. This is the way leading to beauty: not to be ill-tempered or easily upset; even when heavily criticized, not to be offended, provoked, malicious, or resentful; nor to show annoyance, aversion, & bitterness.

"There is the case where a woman or man is envious. He/she envies, begrudges, & broods about others' gains, honor, respect, reverence, salutations, & veneration. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in the plane of deprivation... If instead he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is not influential wherever reborn. This is the way leading to not being influential: to be envious, to envy, begrudge, & brood about others' gains, honor, respect, reverence, salutations, & veneration.

"But then there is the case where a woman or man is not envious. He/she does not envy, begrudge, or brood about others' gains, honor, respect, reverence, salutations, or veneration. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in a good destination... If instead he/she comes to the human state, he/she is influential wherever reborn. This is the way leading to being influential: not to be envious; not to envy, begrudge, or brood about others' gains, honor, respect, reverence, salutations, or veneration.

"There is the case where a woman or man is not a giver of food, drink, cloth, sandals,

garlands, scents, ointments, beds, dwellings, or lighting to brahmans or contemplatives. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death he/she reappears in the plane of deprivation... If instead he/she comes to the human state, he/she is poor wherever reborn. This is the way leading to poverty: not to be a giver of food, drink, cloth, sandals, garlands, scents, ointments, beds, dwellings, or lighting to brahmans or contemplatives.

"But then there is the case where a woman or man is a giver of food, drink, cloth, sandals, scents, ointments, beds, dwellings, & lighting to brahmans & contemplatives. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in a good destination... If instead he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is wealthy wherever reborn. This is the way leading to great wealth: to be a giver of food, drink, cloth, sandals, garlands, scents, ointments, beds, dwellings, & lighting to brahmans & contemplatives.

"There is the case where a woman or man is obstinate & arrogant. He/she does not pay homage to those who deserve homage, rise up for those for whom one should rise up, give a seat to those to whom one should give a seat, make way for those for whom one should make way, worship those who should be worshipped, respect those who should be respected, revere those who should be revered, or honor those who should be honored. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in the plane of deprivation... If instead he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is low-born wherever reborn. This is the way leading to a low birth: to be obstinate & arrogant, not to pay homage to those who deserve homage, nor rise up for... nor give a seat to... nor make way for... nor worship... nor respect... nor revere... nor honor those who should be honored.

"But then there is the case where a woman or man is not obstinate or arrogant; he/she pays homage to those who deserve homage, rises up... gives a seat... makes way... worships... respects... reveres... honors those who should be honored. Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in a good destination... If instead he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is highborn wherever reborn. This is the way leading to a high birth: not to be obstinate or arrogant; to pay homage to those who deserve homage, to rise up... give a seat... make way... worship... respect... revere... honor those who should be honored.

"There is the case where a woman or man when visiting a brahman or contemplative, does not ask: 'What is skillful, venerable sir? What is unskillful? What is blameworthy? What is blameless? What should be cultivated? What should not be cultivated? What, having been done by me, will be for my long-term harm & suffering? Or what, having been done by me, will be for my long-term welfare & happiness?' Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in the plane of deprivation... If instead he/she comes to the human state, then he/she will be stupid wherever reborn. This is the way leading to stupidity: when visiting a brahman or contemplative, not to ask: 'What is skillful?... Or what, having been done by me, will be for my long-term welfare & happiness?'

"But then there is the case where a woman or man when visiting a brahman or contemplative, asks: 'What is skillful, venerable sir? What is unskillful? What is blameworthy? What is blameless? What should be cultivated? What should not be cultivated? What, having been done by me, will be for my long-term harm & suffering? Or what, having been done by me, will be for my long-term welfare & happiness?' Through having adopted & carried out such actions, on the break-up of the body, after death, he/she reappears in a good destination... If instead he/she comes to the human state, then he/she is discerning wherever reborn. This is the way leading to discernment: when visiting a brahman or contemplative, to ask: 'What is skillful?... Or what, having been done by me, will be for my long-term welfare & happiness?'

"So, student, the way leading to short life makes people short-lived, the way leading to long life makes people long-lived; the way leading to sickness makes people sickly, the way leading to health makes people healthy; the way leading to ugliness makes people ugly, the way leading to beauty makes people beautiful; the way leading to lack of influence makes people uninfluential, the way leading to influence makes people influential; the way leading to poverty makes people poor, the way leading to wealth makes people wealthy; the way leading to low birth makes people low-born, the way leading to high birth makes people highborn; the way leading to stupidity makes people stupid, the way leading to discernment makes people discerning.

Beings are owners of kamma, heir to kamma, born of kamma, related through kamma, and have kamma as their arbitrator. Kamma is what creates distinctions among beings in terms of coarseness & refinement...

When this was said, Subha the student, Todeyya's son, said to the Blessed One: "Magnificent, Master Gotama! Magnificent! Just as if he were to place upright what was overturned, to reveal what was hidden, to show the way to one who was lost, or to carry a lamp into the dark so that those with eyes could see forms, in the same way has Master Gotama — through many lines of reasoning — made the Dhamma clear. I go to Master Gotama for refuge, to the Dhamma, and to the Community of monks. May Master Gotama remember me as a lay follower who has gone to him for refuge, from this day forward, for life."

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.135.than.html>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 9th, 2016 at 1:43 PM

Title: Re: Chatral Rinpoche's advice - a question

Content:

tingdzin said:

As far as the first question, hang around here long enough and you will see that there are all kinds of people trying to establish their own version of Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

I never can understand people who do this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 9th, 2016 at 1:41 PM

Title: Sanders takes Dixville Notch in a landslide!

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sanders 4 | Clinton 0

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 9th, 2016 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

FYI,

I started a Facebook group, Buddhists for Bernie 2016.

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1682090535408406/>

dzogchungpa said:

May I suggest the name "Bernisattvas"?

Malcolm wrote:

Awesome!!!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 9th, 2016 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

FYI,

I started a Facebook group, Buddhists for Bernie 2016.

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1682090535408406/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 9th, 2016 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist centres, cultural alienation, etc.

Content:

Jeff H said:

It seems to me that respect and reverence are states of mind first that will later express themselves appropriately according to the degree we are able to hold them.

Malcolm wrote:

If you practice Dharma, that is the real prostration. I see a lot of people prostrating, who then fail to practice Dharma.

Gesture of respect appropriate in Asian cultures may not be appropriate in non-asian cultures.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 8th, 2016 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist centres, cultural alienation, etc.

Content:

WJ77 said:

Nobody prostrates.

Malcolm wrote:

You would really hate Dzogchen community then, we don't even bow, let alone prostrate.

When our teacher comes into the room, we stand. Then he asks us to sit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 8th, 2016 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: 8 lines of praise to Heruka and Vajrayogini

Content:

Tigersnest said:

Is there a sanskrit version available or in circulation of these prayers?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you can find it David Gray's translation of the root tantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, February 7th, 2016 at 12:58 AM

Title: Re: What is the objective of Mahayana Buddhist practice?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

One may also work to make the Pure Land real in this world, while knowing that this world has been the Pure Land all along.

boda said:

If one knew this world was the Pure Land one wouldn't work to make it so. One can believe it's the Pure Land, however.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhafiels need to be purified. That being said, there is an important passage about

purifying buddhafiels, and the innate purity of even impure fields like this one in the Vimalakirti Nirdesha sūtra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, February 6th, 2016 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

rachmiel said:

Okay, it's a training, meaning (I assume) it is not meant to be taken literally, rather as a "poetic license" pointer.

But I still don't get it. Matter and emptiness seem categorically different. To say "Emptiness is matter" sounds like saying something like "Existence is body." (Not meant to be a literal translation, rather an example of the mix of two categorically different terms.) It does not compute!

Malcolm wrote:

It is a training meant to lead one to understand that all phenomena do not arise and do not cease.

It has exactly the same meaning as the mangalam of the Nāgārjuna's MMK.

Emptiness is matter, matter is empty means there is no matter to find that is not empty, and no emptiness to look for apart from matter.

The result of looking for matter, is that it is not found ultimately. It is a mere empty appearance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 5th, 2016 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

vidyā means knowledge

Wayfarer said:

I'm not saying it doesn't mean that, but there are different senses of 'knowledge'.

A question I have about the Sanskrit root 'vid-' - do you think it might be related to the Latin 'videre', meaning 'to see' (which is also the root of 'vision', 'video')? Because then 'a-vidya' means un-knowledge in the sense of 'not seeing', as in 'not seeing the meaning, purpose or point'.

Malcolm wrote:

It absolutely is related to the root, vid.

So yes, in this case, avidyā means not seeing the principle of causes and results, for example, when we apply the term to the first link of dependent origination.

"I came, I saw I conquered," as Caesar said.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 5th, 2016 at 5:11 AM

Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?

Content:

Wayfarer said:

I've been thinking that a better translation for avidya than 'ignorance' is 'unwisdom'. The word 'ignorance' carries a question: ignorant concerning what? The road rules? Grammar? Etiquette? Whereas, etymologically, 'a-vidya' literally means 'not seeing right'. So, 'unwisdom' is a better word, I think - a condition which is indeed the common lot of humanity unless they take pains to overcome it.

So in this context, avidya is not realising emptiness, or not seeing the inherent insubstantiality of things, therefore clinging, therefore suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

I appreciate your observation, and I have been down that road too. Unfortunately, vidyā means knowledge, for example, like the five sciences (pañcavidyāsthana) and so on, and as a verb, it is used exactly the way we use the verb "to know."

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 5th, 2016 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: The "four methods" that prove the existence of future li

Content:

Aemilius said:

Certain Madhyamaka thinkers, like Candrakirti and Nagarjuna (in Yuktisastika Vritti, Sixty Stanzas on Reasoning Commentary), refute the independent or substantial existence of consciousness. The proof given is the teaching of Twelve Links of Dependent Arising, where consciousness is preceded by volition (samskara), which is preceded by ignorance (avidya). Hence consciousness is dependent on them and is void of substantial existence.

Nagarjuna attacks the presumed substantial existence of consciousness also in the Mulamadhyamaka Karika, for example in Chapter Nine: Investigation of the Existence of Something Prior.

Adamantine said:

Consciousness here is different than clarity and awareness, don't conflate them.

Malcolm wrote:

Clarity and awareness do not have substantial existence either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, February 5th, 2016 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

rachmiel said:

Here's something I don't quite get:

Form is emptiness. No problem with that. Form is clearly empty of ... (svabhava).

But:

Emptiness is form. Hmm ... that's confusing. I grok "is empty of." But "emptiness" as a subject/noun, not so much, because it seems to want to reify "being empty." Does EiF mean anything nontrivially *different* from FiE? If so, what?

Malcolm wrote:

Just a minor correction to the translation you are using, it should be:

"Matter [the material aggregate] is empty (adjective). Emptiness (noun) is matter [one to one identity]. [Therefore] there is no matter apart from emptiness; there is no emptiness apart from matter."

The same goes for the rest of the five aggregates, as it is said:

Likewise, sensation, perception, formations and consciousness are empty...That being so, all phenomena are emptiness, signlessness, not arising, not ceasing, neither tainted nor free from taints; neither increasing nor decreasing.

So, it is an identity proposition about the nature of reality. But it is not really a proposition, since the sūtra says that this analysis is a training. A training in what? A training in seeing that the five aggregates, all contaminated phenomena are empty of a svabhāva, an inherent nature.

However, not only contaminated phenomena are empty of a svabhāva, an inherent nature, but also so called pure phenomena, nirvana and so on.

The message? There is nothing to cling to.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 4th, 2016 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?

Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:

As far as I know, emptiness can be pointed out with help of a teacher in person. So get an "explanation" that way.

smcj said:

Just as a general note, the "pointing out instructions" are mostly pretty rare. Customarily they are to be given by a realized master for a student that is "ripe". There's no harm in participating in a public pointing out, I'm sure there's karmic blessings involved. ChNN gives them quite regularly. However that's not how it goes as a routine thing; the idea that if one is not karmically prepared for it, it won't work anyway. If it worked consistently then that's all anybody would do, and it would spread across the globe like wildfire.

Wouldn't that be nice?

Malcolm wrote:

"Pointing out" (ngo 'phrod) and "direct introduction" (rang ngo thag tu 'phrad pa) are not the same thing, actually.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, February 4th, 2016 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: The TM equivalent of xanax

Content:

lotwell said:

Couldn't find the new topic button in the tibetan medicine forum.

So anyways... is there something that parallels xanax or similar drugs in tibetan medicine?

warm regards

Malcolm wrote:

If you have an anxiety disorder, you should try and speak to a qualified TM practitioner.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 12:33 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Trump has upped the ante.

Taco_Rice said:

Trump has at least allowed a great deal of people to believe that their concerns have been heard in our system.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, people like David Duke.

Taco_Rice said:
""homophobia""

That's your gay agenda. A term which could be defined as, "actions which hinder or oppose our gay agenda."

Malcolm wrote:
Ummm, I am not gay....

Taco_Rice said:
People will often choose whichever options are advertised or propagandized at them most effectively and most forcefully.

Malcolm wrote:
Umm, no. Education means training people to make their own choices.

Taco_Rice said:
Your kids, but under our educational system, their choice, and rightly so.
I have the right to pass my values on to my children.

Malcolm wrote:
No, you only have the right to advocate your values to your children, and should they eventually disagree with your values, then that is their choice.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 6:39 AM
Title: Re: POTUS 2016
Content:

Taco_Rice said:
Trump has brought nothing into the conversation at all apart from lies, racism and xenophobia.
The conversation is already full of lies and agendas that do not serve the public good.

Malcolm wrote:
Trump has upped the ante.

Taco_Rice said:
We don't have to propagandize anyone, merely educate women. And there is nothing at all wrong with redistribution.
This is population control.

Malcolm wrote:
No, it is women choosing not to have children.

Taco_Rice said:
We live in a culture where people will balk at being explicitly told not to have kids, so there's a system in place to try to create a social stigma to having children and create

barriers to forming families.

Malcolm wrote:

Ummmm.... we live in a culture where women are empowered to feel they have a right to choose whether or not they want children. Many don't.

Taco_Rice said:

There's also an agenda on the part of gay activists to try to push their lifestyle choice as far as possible in the legal system and popular culture—even and especially onto children.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is absolute nonsense. There is no Gay Agenda. This is just homophobia.

Taco_Rice said:

It isn't so much that one can "simply educate women," but that women are educated in a certain way.

Malcolm wrote:

Educating women just means allowing women to learn.

Taco_Rice said:

I don't judge.

Malcolm wrote:

This is an obviously disingenuous statement.

Taco_Rice said:

It's your life and your choice. But they're my kids.

Malcolm wrote:

Your kids, but under our educational system, their choice, and rightly so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 5:29 AM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

seeker242 said:

I'm I am suggesting non-harming to sentient beings and being criticized for that by "experienced dharma practitioners".

Malcolm wrote:

You are over-defining what avihimsa actually means. It is for this reason I am criticizing your point of view.

The Vegan definition of ahimsa and the Buddha's teaching on ahimsa are not the same.

The Vegan definition of ahimsa comes from Gandhi, and while Gandhi was not a Jain, he was strongly influenced by Jainism in his views. Like the Jains, not only are you defining ahimsa as avoiding killing, you over extend it to mean that you should not drink milk, use honey, etc. This is far beyond the range of what Buddha taught as ahimsa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Clarification re: Dharmakaya and ...

Content:

smcj said:

This is ground upon which both Gelug and Gzhan stong are frequently criticized (justifiably), and just as often, the objects of such criticism try to defend their novelties with baseless hermeneutics.

So both the Gelugpas and Karma Kagyupas are off base. Lol, no bias there!

Malcolm wrote:

Not all Karma Kagyus were gzhan stong pas (for example, the 8th Karmapa, who refuted it). Gzhan stong only became a Karma Kagyu brand in the late 18th century. And even then, really only at Palpung, which had a close relationship with the Kathok (the one Nyingma monastery where it was very prevalent, also from the late 18th century, as I have already explained to you).

So, it is not that Karma Kagyu is "off base", since gzhan stong does not define it, it is just gzhan stong that is a bit of a problem. Gelug view is more or less a mirror image of gzhan stong.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 5:15 AM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

seeker242 said:

So it's not disrespectful for you to laugh at me, but it is for me to do the same? Isn't that interesting...

Malcolm wrote:

I was not laughing at you, and I was suggesting that you not be disrespectful to Simon.

You know, in a conversation where someone says something amusing, then you laugh. It does not mean you are laughing at them. I don't laugh at people unless they truly are being ridiculous. As much I may disagree with your (nonbuddhist) ideology, I don't think you are being ridiculous. We have dzogchungpa for that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You seem not to understand the history of civil rights.

Taco_Rice said:

You seem not to understand why Feminist ideals of gender equality fail in poorer nations, slums and ghettos.

Malcolm wrote:

Quite simply, it is merely a matter of education.

Taco_Rice said:

Granting rights to various minority groups is a matter of politics, that is, of persuasion, appeal to sympathies and threats of force, whereas creating the Feminist standard of gender equality is only attainable by redistribution of resources and constant propagandizing. The former only changes the terms of relations between groups within the larger whole, the latter is a force that effects the entire civilization pervasively.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and education creates opportunities for women, which is why groups like the Taliban are so vehemently opposed to educating women. They know what happens when they have to deal with educated women. So they try to kill them and prevent their education in first place.

We don't have to propagandize anyone, merely educate women. And there is nothing at all wrong with redistribution.

Trump lost Iowa. Awesome.

New Hampshire.

People don't like losers, especially poor ones.

<http://www.loser.com>

At the very least, Trump has brought into the discussion many things which could have exploded to the surface. Hopefully the future is a more balanced place with more prosperity and appreciation, where path and purpose cultivate hearts and minds of goodwill.

Trump has brought nothing into the conversation at all apart from lies, racism and xenophobia.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 4:53 AM

Title: Re: Clarification re: Dharmakaya and ...

Content:

smcj said:

Changing the teachings to fit into one's comfort zone is introducing unawareness into the teachings--even if it is with good intentions.

Malcolm wrote:

Many arguments among scholars have to do with departures from standard definitions and understandings. In Tibetan, such departures are called "rang bzo," literally, "personal fabrications." A lot of effort is spent by Tibetan scholars to prove they are doing nothing original, and their opponents point of view is "novel."

This is ground upon which both Gelug and Gzhan stong are frequently criticized (justifiably), and just as often, the objects of such criticism try to defend their novelties with baseless hermeneutics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

seeker242 said:

And that would warrant a capitol HAHHAHAHA.

Malcolm wrote:

No need to be disrespectful.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 4:47 AM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

seeker242 said:

Buddhadharma points unflinchingly to non-harming of sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Avihimsa is a mental factor associated with all positive minds in the desire realm. It is not, within Buddhadharma, an ideological commitment. It is connected with personal conduct (śīla), specifically, of actively engaging in killing other sentient beings.

You would be very surprised at how few sūtras mention it. It is mentioned in only two Vinaya texts, twenty three sūtras, and eleven tantric texts in the Tibetan Canon. These mentions are very brief. In other words, there is very little sustained discussion of this concept, and certainly no ideological dimension in any of the discussions of

nonharming.

While it is true that the benefits of being free from a harmful mind is praiseworthy, what it boils down to is that if your mind is free from harmfulness, himsa, you will not kill things, or ask others to do so for you.

It has nothing to do with whether or not you use honey, milk, eat meat, wear leather shoes, or even furs. It has everything to do with how you treat sentient beings you encounter day to day and your freedom from the impulse to harm them.

Using honey is not harmful to bees, no more than milking cows is harmful to cows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 4:17 AM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

Simon E. said:

Buddhadharma points unflinchingly to the reality of this realm..that every breath and every step and every meal causes harm to sentient beings. It does not attempt to sidestep that as Jainadharma does. Buddhadharma says that the only way to stop harming other sentient forms is to realise a state where all difference between self and other is transcended..where all is seen as arising in great emptiness..and that realisation is not a product of any diet. Neither is any diet a bar to it. It is of a different level of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

It's hopeless. Some people are dead set in thinking that their diet is a key to liberation, sadly, even Buddhists have this delusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

seeker242 said:

Here is the proper definition of veganism from the vegan society themselves.

<https://www.vegansociety.com/go-vegan/definition-veganism>

"Veganism is a way of living which seeks to exclude, as far as is possible and practicable, all forms of exploitation of, and cruelty to, animals for food, clothing or any other purpose."

...In dietary terms it denotes the practice of dispensing with all products derived wholly or partly from animals.

Malcolm wrote:

This means of course, eschewing the use of animal fertilizers, etc.

Hahahaha, you think one lifetime of avoiding meat is going to eliminate all the countless offenses of killing and eating meat you have engaged in since beginningless time?

Dream on.

Hahahahaha, you think it's me saying that meanwhile I'm simply quoting a sutra that was posted.

It is important to distinguish the provisional from the definitive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

Simon E. said:

Buddharma says that all samsaric life is characterised by death and death dealing. All sentient forms consume and are consumed in endless cycles. We cannot live without causing harm. It is not even an end in Buddhadharma as it is in Jainadharma. We can however develop compassion and we can end samsara for ourselves.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct. One's liberation does not depend on one's diet. Buddhadharma is not based on what one eats. Though there are some provisional teachings for attracting nonbuddhists that may make it seem so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

#Coingate:

http://www.salon.com/2016/02/02/critics_cry_foul_over_coingate_hillary_clinton_had_1_6_chance_of_winning_6_coin_tosses_that_made_her_winner_in_iowa/

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

seeker242 said:

...all meat eaters are greedy, ignorant, foul smelling and guilty of countless offenses.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahaha, you think one lifetime of avoiding meat is going to eliminate all the countless offenses of killing and eating meat you have engaged in since beginningless time? Dream on.

```
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: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 3:43 AM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

seeker242 said:

Of course, it is not a hypothesis because it has been proven.

Malcolm wrote:

Proven, how exactly?

seeker242 said:

Typically being the key word. Typically, vegans don't oppose things that are actually necessary, like crops being pollinated. The very definition of veganism itself states this. The Vegan Society soon clear that it rejected the use of animals for any purpose, not only as food, and in 1951 it defined veganism as "the doctrine that man should live without exploiting animals."

Malcolm wrote:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Veganism>

So you are saying there is some kind of Veganism that permits animals to be exploited, for example, kept to produce manure for food production and so forth?

In any case, Veganism is not Buddhism, was not taught by the Buddha, and is not a part of Buddhadharma. If anything, it is has closer ties to Jainism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

Norwegian said:

So, as we all know, the Buddha was omniscient. He did not talk nonsense. If he stated that honey was actually acceptable to eat, and, in fact for monks something that could be eaten outside of their limited rations (when considered as medicine), and also something that is considered as good food for meditators, it goes without saying, that in order to eat honey, you necessarily have to collect it before consumption.

Honey has had a central place in Buddhadharma since day one as a very precious substance, and there is nothing wrong with it. Observe the following, from the Lankavatara Sutra:

" Now, Mahamati, the diet I have allowed for my disciples to take is satisfying to all wise people, but is avoided by the unwise. This diet produces many merits, keeps away many harmful effects, and was prescribed by the ancient sages. It comprises rice, barley, wheat, kidney beans, beans, lentils, oil, honey, molasses, treacle, sugar cane, coarse sugar, and similar foods. Food prepared with these ingredients is proper food.

This goes to show that the Buddha was not a vegan.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because also milk is included, and monks were allowed to wear leather shoes and fur in cold climates.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: Clarification re: Dharmakaya and ...

Content:

Matt J said:

Better not speak to Yunmen, then.

A monk asked Yün-men, "What is Buddha?" [雲門因僧問如何是佛]

Yün-men said, "Dried shitstick." [門云乾屎橛]

Malcolm wrote:

And no, I do not think it is correct to claim one can just redefine things however one wants, because if so, dharmakāya can become God, Buddha can become shit, and so on.

Well, in this case, a sentient being is a wet shitstick, so it works out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Clarification re: Dharmakaya and ...

Content:

smcj said:

The term "tathāgatagarbha" has a consistent definition.

If so, then do you accept that definition to be as HH KARMAPA VIII defined it as quoted in this thread (a.k.a. Shentong)?

If not, will you concede that different sects and authors, such as HHK8, re-define terms as they please?

Malcolm wrote:

The Eighth Karmapa's definition as presented by you conflates sūtra and mantra definitions. And no, I do not think it is correct to claim one can just redefine things however one wants, because if so, dharmakāya can become God, Buddha can become shit, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I think the evidence shows that plants form communities which bear all the signs of sentience.

And of course, in my opinion, we need to recognize that plants are also sentient communities. Even colonies of bacteria display sentient properties.

dzogchungpa said:

This is kind of interesting. Could you say a little more about what you mean and its ethical implications, if any?

Mother's Lap said:

Lambert Schmithausen has two books/thesis' on plant sentience in Buddhism, and this is what I could find of this author that's freely available and deals with ethics.

http://dharmaflower.net/_collection/earlybuddhist.pdf Lambert Schmithausen, The Problem of Sentience of Plants in Early Buddhism,

— id., Plants in Early Buddhism.

(Thanks to mutsuk).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Clarification re: Dharmakaya and ...

Content:

smcj said:

I've been trying to make the point lately that terms mean whatever the author in question wants them to mean...

'When I use a word,' Humpty Dumpty said, in rather a scornful tone, 'it means just what I choose it to mean — neither more nor less.'

So are you saying terms are consistently defined across time, sects and authors?
Specifically Dharmadhatu and Tathagatagarbha?

Malcolm wrote:

The term "tathāgatagarbha" has a consistent definition. The term "dharmadhātu" changes in meaning depending on whether we are talking about Hinayāna, Mahāyāna or Vajrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Trump lost Iowa. Awesome.

MiphamFan said:

Cruz is worse than Trump dude.

Malcolm wrote:

Cruz has no chance in a general election. He is too far to the right.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Astus said:

What is this simultaneity important for? Certainly not for relaying teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is important for relaying the teachings. We have already discussed this you and I.
Not into a repeat.

Queequeg said:

Can you link the discussion?

Malcolm wrote:

It was in a thread on direct introduction

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Astus said:

What is this simultaneity important for? Certainly not for relaying teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is important for relaying the teachings. We have already discussed this you and I.
Not into a repeat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

seeker242 said:

No, it is not just a hypothesis

Of course it is a hypothesis, untested, unproven, etc.

Yes so according to vegan ideology. You say that because you don't know what vegan ideology actually is.

Malcolm wrote:

Vegans typically regard humans using animals for any reason at all as wrong.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 11:39 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Trump lost Iowa. Awesome.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 10:19 AM

Title: Re: Clarification re: Dharmakaya and ...

Content:

smcj said:

Have you taken a look at it? It's not Madhyamaka.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a text of secret mantra. For example, it discusses Mahāyoga, abhiṣekas, luminosity and so on. It is by the author of the Bodhicittavivarana.

smcj said:

I've been trying to make the point lately that terms mean whatever the author in question wants them to mean...

Malcolm wrote:

'When I use a word,' Humpty Dumpty said, in rather a scornful tone, 'it means just what I choose it to mean — neither more nor less.'

'The question is,' said Alice, 'whether you can make words mean so many different things.'

'The question is,' said Humpty Dumpty, 'which is to be master — that's all.'

Alice was too much puzzled to say anything; so after a minute Humpty Dumpty began again. 'They've a temper, some of them — particularly verbs: they're the proudest — adjectives you can do anything with, but not verbs — however, I can manage the whole lot of them! Impenetrability! That's what I say!'

'Would you tell me please,' said Alice, 'what that means?'

'Now you talk like a reasonable child,' said Humpty Dumpty, looking very much pleased.

'I meant by "impenetrability" that we've had enough of that subject, and it would be just as well if you'd mention what you mean to do next, as I suppose you don't mean to stop here all the rest of your life.'

'That's a great deal to make one word mean,' Alice said in a thoughtful tone.

'When I make a word do a lot of work like that,' said Humpty Dumpty, 'I always pay it extra.'

'Oh!' said Alice. She was too much puzzled to make any other remark.

http://sabian.org/looking_glass6.php

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 10:07 AM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Queequeg said:

Here's what I'm getting - the interaction with a teacher must be temporally immediate, but not spatially immediate.

Malcolm wrote:

With modern tech, this is possible, yes.

Queequeg said:

The interaction must be through the medium of a common language - mediation through an interpreter OK.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Queequeg said:

The interaction does not have to be mutual - in the sense of individual intercourse - but interaction from teacher to student is the critical factor.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Queequeg said:

How about telecast, in a language I don't understand, but with subtitles...

Malcolm wrote:

If they are simultaneous, yup. This is mediation through interpretation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 10:01 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Taco_Rice said:

This only works so long as the men are well behaved.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, when women stand up for themselves, men don't stand a chance.

Taco_Rice said:

Not without the support of at least some men. The only support women, as a whole, really need is from powerful men, but then this brings us to the issue of how power is obtained and maintained. A society where men are ruthlessly grabbing for power rather than, say, contributing scientific genius or building infrastructure looks a lot like the third world... or a given ghetto. What gender do you think most of the enforcers will be? How many f***s do you think are given by those enforcers in highly unequal societies?

Malcolm wrote:

You seem not to understand the history of civil rights.

Taco_Rice said:

That's exactly what happened as Christianity became more willing to placate popular opinion rather than to direct it.

Malcolm wrote:

No, people in European nations and their derivatives have gradually ceased having faith in Christianity as their core story, their core explanation of the world. This will gradually happen in Muslim countries as well, as they struggle to adapt to globalization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 9:56 AM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

seeker242 said:

Well posted, yet with no relation whatsoever to stealing honey from bees. And conveniently, but not surprisingly, no mention of the fact that bees can pollinate crops just fine without someone stealing their honeycomb.

Malcolm wrote:

Not so, according to Vegan ideology, raising bees to be used for pollination violates their rights.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 9:54 AM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

seeker242 said:

The idea that a vegan diet is less harmful is a fact.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not a fact. It is a hypothesis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 4:38 AM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Queequeg said:

How about telecast - ie. the live feed is one way?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 4:32 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Taco_Rice said:

This only works so long as the men are well behaved.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, when women stand up for themselves, men don't stand a chance.

Taco_Rice said:

You might say that Christianity "turned the other cheek," when attacked, until it could finally begin to be destroyed.

Malcolm wrote:

Hardly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 4:29 AM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Queequeg said:

What about mediation through a sign interpreter? Or for that matter, any interpreter?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup.

Queequeg said:

How about oral interaction between teacher and student who do not speak each other's languages?

Malcolm wrote:

Nope.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 3:37 AM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Queequeg said:

\

How about IM?

Malcolm wrote:

No.

Queequeg said:

Facetime?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Queequeg said:

Telephone

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Queequeg said:

The deaf can't participate in the Buddhist traditions.

Correct or incorrect?

dzogchungpa said:

I say incorrect. I think the real point is interaction with teachers, not so much the sense modalities involved in interacting with them.

Queequeg said:

Is this interaction limited to an immediate, personal interaction?

How about mail or email correspondence?

Malcolm wrote:

You cannot teach Dharma through the mail or email. This is why there is no teaching of Dharma here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Queequeg said:

The deaf can't participate in the Buddhist traditions.

Correct or incorrect?

Malcolm wrote:

Traditionally, correct. These days, incorrect, since we have sign language.

One of the eight freedoms which are part of the eighteen freedoms and endowments of a precious human birth is freedom from defective sense organs and limbs.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 2:59 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Taco_Rice said:

The West (except, to my knowledge, those f***in' Aussies!1!!) seems to be keen on taking in immigrants left and right. Why? Why take in immigrants rather than simply foster conditions in one's country that will cause people to produce more families and

more children?

Malcolm wrote:

What happens, around the world, is that when women are educated they have less children.

This is one of the reasons why Islam will ultimately fail to achieve the goals you imagine. As Muslim women are educated, they will toss off the shackles of their religion, and birth rates in Muslim countries will also fall. This is already happening in the US.

As I have pointed out before, this cultural conflict between Islam and the West is really about Women's Rights, reproductive and otherwise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No dude. Muslims who come here will be Americanized. They will, as they are doing, adopt liberal western values, etc.

Taco_Rice said:

Nah (¬) brodhisattva. Their more extremist agitators will merely double down when they see they have the advantage, as their religion encourages them to do, and gradually move society in their direction as the West takes in, and begins producing, more Muslims—"modernized" or not. (I imagine they will also change what "modernized" comes to mean, at that.)

Malcolm wrote:

No, the Scottish Enlightenment, which produced modern Capitalism and Socialism, is a much more virulent contagion than Islam. In terms of infectious power, Islam cannot compare. It will sicken and die, just like Christianity before it.

In other words, to change the metaphor slightly, Islam as an invasive species has already been outcompeted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

DGA said:

Tell us where there be dragons of opinion, and where the treasure of scholarly certitude is to be found.

Malcolm wrote:

It's blatantly obvious:

Tibetan Buddhists = dragons of opinion

Sino-Japanese Buddhists = treasures of scholarly certitude

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Consuming honey is really terrible, isn't it?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it really, really sucks...and you know, it is not fair that all those bees pollinate all those crops [for Vegans and others] without health insurance, 401ks, etc. I really think people should get out there and do their own damn pollination.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

DGA said:

If Sanders wins, he should expect a Congress at least as actively hostile and belligerent as the one that Obama has had to deal with.

Malcolm wrote:

It will be more belligerent and hostile. Sanders knows this. This is why, should he win, we can expect an activist president who spends a lot of time talking to people and "invigorating their clarity," voting out senators and representatives that do not represent their interests, and voting in one's who do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Clarification re: Dharmakaya and ...

Content:

Astus said:

Emptiness

- as the nature of all appearances: dharmadhatu

- as the wisdom of buddhas: dharmakaya

smcj said:

As far as it goes that's right (I think). The confusion comes in when, as Malcolm has recently posted, it is then said tha buddhas see phenomena as wisdoms, thus making the Dharmakaya the nature of appearances as well.

Malcolm wrote:

Guru Kampala said:

The deep and wide ocean is filled with jewels
which the nāga kings enjoy, amazing!

Likewise, all appearances and sound have always been dharmakāya
which the realized have enjoyed, amazing!

Guru Anaṅga said:

Once one is caught by the poisonous dregs
of clinging ignorance,
true existence is grasped in this rainbow-like body
of essenceless samsara.

When the illnesses of clinging are cleansed,
even samsara is the dharmakāya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 12:57 AM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

seeker242 said:

Nothing happens to it because "my Vegan ideology", as you call it, causes the least
amount of harm possible to all of the above.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you are merely shifting blame to someone else on your own behalf. The idea that a
vegan diet is "less harmful" is a fantasy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 12:34 AM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Vegan ideology is not Buddhadharma, however, and people should keep this distinction
in mind.

Honey, milk, butter etc. are all acceptable foods, even in most strict interpretations of
Mahāyāna,

seeker242 said:

Buddhadharma doesn't say it's ok for people to exploit animals. Causing them to suffer
unnecessarily, because it tastes good, even in the most lax interpretations of Mahāyāna.
Kindness to, and non-harming of, animals is inherent to all forms of Buddhadharma.

Vegan ideology is Buddhadharma because Vegan ideology = kindness, compassion and non-harming of sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhadharma says we must even treat the soil with kindness, the plants that live in it, etc. Avihimsa does not merely apply to animals. It applies to the entire world. And of course, in my opinion, we need to recognize that plants are also sentient communities. Even colonies of bacteria display sentient properties. What happens to your Vegan ideology then?

Life feeds on Life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Simon E. said:

VERY similar to Jeremy Corbyn's message to the Brit electorate, something is clearly afoot.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Clarification re: Dharmakaya and ...

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hi Wayfarer:

Dhātu is actually defined as a "source" such as a mine. It is never defined as "body." This definition is continuous from Abhidharma to Dzogchen.

Wayfarer said:

from my scanty knowledge, 'dhatu' is terminology from the Sanskrit abhidharma, referring to the 'body' or 'element'...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, February 2nd, 2016 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Simon E. said:

Within two presidency terms though Malcolm ?

We in the UK have our first Socialist Labour Party leader for 25 years.. I think he signals a movement back to Socialism.

He is a forerunner. The next socialist Prime Minister of the UK will be in 12 years at the earliest.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, put it this way, Simon. Sanders has fanned the flames of the progressive enthusiasm that withered under Obama.

The difference between Sanders and all the other candidates out there is this: they all say in one voice, "Elect me, and I will take care of you. You can relax once I am elected." This is the standard message of American politicians since Nixon.

Sanders is saying, "Electing me is only the beginning. Without you, without continuous engagement in the democratic process, nothing will change. It is up to you, not me."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 1st, 2016 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

America will be as socialist as Scandanavia if not this presidency then within the next two. Why? Millennials are a huge population and they support Sanders by a huge margin. There is a cultural and political sea change occurring in the US. Legal pot, completely upending traditional relationships and even gender, it goes on and on. In 16 years the political establishment we know will seem as outmoded as the civil war era. Honestly Bernie has a great shot at winning. If he loses, the pressure will go way up and the next president after this one will be a Sandersian. Sanders is making a huge impact.

Simon E. said:

As an outsider, I hope you are right. If I were a betting man though I would lay a large wedge that you are not.

Malcolm wrote:

The social and economic "conservatives" in the US are mainly white, middle class, and their demographic is shrinking exponentially. For example, the majority of children in grade school in Iowa are non-white.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 1st, 2016 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

I do think Americans would be stupid to elect Trump and I do hope that they don't do it.

Taco_Rice said:

Neither I, and I imagine Michel Houellebecq, can understand why you do not recognize that the same is profoundly more true regarding the election of mainstream politicians. If I and others choose to elect Clark Kent in place of the regular movie extras placed into their glorified customer service positions by those who run the world, what does it matter if we suspect he may be Superman? Hopefully he's actually Lex Luther and brings us the intolerable.

Malcolm wrote:

No dude. Muslims who come here will be Americanized. They will, as they are doing, adopt liberal western values, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 1st, 2016 at 12:29 PM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

seeker242 said:

The reason why honey isn't vegan is because it is stealing.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the reason why honey is not "vegan" is because Vegans believe honey bees are exploited. In general, Vegan philosophy is based on the idea of animal rights.

seeker242 said:

That right. And keeping bees so people can steal their honey, is itself, an exploitation.

Malcolm wrote:

Vegan ideology is not Buddhadharma, however, and people should keep this distinction in mind.

Honey, milk, butter etc. are all acceptable foods, even in most strict interpretations of Mahāyāna,

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 1st, 2016 at 12:26 PM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

rory said:

[

Kudos Astus, well posted, it's nice to see assertions supported with scholarly content

as opposed to mere opinion.

Malcolm wrote:

You are hilarious. Astus is a nice person, but he loves taking indefensible positions merely for the hell of it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 1st, 2016 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: Father Francis Tiso Dzogchen & Early Christianity Connec

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Predictably, I will tell you that Father Tiso's book, while interesting, is not to be taken seriously by practitioners.

It is a mishmash, at best. However, his account of Khenpo Acho is quite nice.

Norwegian said:

That is what I expected...

How long is the part about Khenpo Acho? Worth buying the book just for that?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 1st, 2016 at 3:37 AM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

seeker242 said:

The reason why honey isn't vegan is because it is stealing.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the reason why honey is not "vegan" is because Vegans believe honey bees are exploited. In general, Vegan philosophy is based on the idea of animal rights.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 1st, 2016 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: Father Francis Tiso Dzogchen & Early Christianity Connec

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Predictably, I will tell you that Father Tiso's book, while interesting, is not to be taken seriously by practitioners.

It is a mishmash, at best. However, his account of Khenpo Acho is quite nice.

Unfortunately, I will have to argue with people inspired by his syncretism and uncritical acceptance of some western academic bloviators for the rest of my life.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 1st, 2016 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Tsongkhapa Madhyamaka

Content:

Matt J said:

So is the point of Gelugpa Madhyamaka really to establish a conceptual view of emptiness...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, February 1st, 2016 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: Samadhi

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You really do not understand the point.

Samadhi is a caitta, a mental factor, that all creatures possess, not matter in what realm, desire, form or formless.

This definition is basic Abhidharma.

Saoshun said:

but that's means nothing. it's like saying stone posses inherent buddha nature. whatever it poses or not, for the stone it means nothing.

Malcolm wrote:

You are failing to distinguish how that mental factor is being used. For example, a hunter uses his mental factor of samadhi to aim and shoot. A Dharma practitioner on the other hand uses his mental factor of samadhi to engage a path dharma, etc. Nevertheless, samadhi is one of the ten neutral mental factors possessed by all sentient beings. When someone properly studies Buddhadharma, they understand such points are noncontroversial.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 31st, 2016 at 11:34 AM

Title: Re: Samadhi

Content:

Saoshun said:

yes, I understand yogacara view, but there is good story pointing out this thing from chan lore, you all know it probably about boat monk-master who beated up guy with the sandal? So when he said first "dharmakaya have no form" and after awakening, it's different.

I mean the view can bring realization in some students, but believing that everybody are in samadhi is nuts, there are not even everybody, there is only your experience and expression of those, so if you are in samadhi Malco, that's great, teach me if it's that possible.

Malcolm wrote:

You really do not understand the point.

Samadhi is a caitta, a mental factor, that all creatures possess, not matter in what realm, desire, form or formless.

This definition is basic Abhidharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 31st, 2016 at 11:29 AM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

rory said:

Now for a nice example of a great modern master who was deeply influenced by reading Buddhist books and achieved great levels of realization as a hermit: Hsu Yun
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hsu_Yun

Malcolm wrote:

But of course:

During his years as a hermit, Hsu Yun made some of his most profound discoveries. He visited the old master Yung Ching, who encouraged him to abandon his extreme asceticism in favor of temperance. He instructed the young monk in the sutras and told him to be mindful of the Hua Tou, "Who is dragging this corpse of mine?"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 31st, 2016 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: Samadhi

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In Buddhadharma, samadhi is a neutral mental factor that accompanies all minds. Everyone experiences samadhi all the time, every time they focus their attention single pointedly.

Different kinds of one-pointedness are given different names, for example, vajropama samadhi.

Saoshun said:

That's not true.

Malcolm wrote:

Take it up with Vasubandhu and Asanga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 31st, 2016 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: Taigen Shodo Harada Roshi Introduction to Zen

Content:

Dan74 said:

What we see, boda, is our thoughts about Jundo, and the rules of the forum say very clearly, no ad homs. So we continue to discuss what is said, not who is saying it. Otherwise I might comment on your continued disregard of this rule, but I guess it would be just as futile.

Malcolm wrote:

When someone makes personal claims on a public forum, it is not "ad hominem" to discuss them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 31st, 2016 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

DGA said:

Does anyone know of an example of a contemporary or historical Buddhist master who has attained any degree of realization with nothing in support of his or her endeavors (in this lifetime) but a library card? (or audio/video recording for that matter?)

Any examples at all?

Anybody?

Malcolm wrote:

Astus will be the first, based on his primordial vow of refusing to have a teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 31st, 2016 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: Misterious message in a pendant

Content:

53RG10 said:

Thank you for the clarification. I hope I will be still able to find someone capable of translating it.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not translatable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 31st, 2016 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: Misterious message in a pendant

Content:

53RG10 said:

Hello everyone,

Some months ago I found a pendant on the pavement (see link) and inside I found a rolled paper with something written on it.

After long searches I discovered it is Tibetan. I was trying to translate by myself, but it is more difficult than I expected, so I would like to ask you to help me understand what this message says.

Here is the link to the images:

<https://drive.switch.ch/public.php?service=files&t=2812eaf6647946b191df1b4a19b84ea7>

Thank you for reading my topic.

Kind Regards,

Sergio

Malcolm wrote:

It is not Tibetan. It a liberation through wearing amulet written in Dakini script.

It is not really translatable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 31st, 2016 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Samadhi

Content:

Saoshun said:

Did you ever been/experienced samadhi? Cleary not, even one samadhi makes person mind little sage-ish.

Malcolm wrote:

In Buddhadharma, samadhi is a neutral mental factor that accompanies all minds. Everyone experiences samadhi all the time, every time they focus their attention single pointedly.

Different kinds of one-pointedness are given different names, for example, vajropama samadhi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 31st, 2016 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Jeff H said:

Could it be that hearing from a master and reading sutras and shastras serve different purposes?

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing inherently wrong with reading. I read many sūtras and śāstras, as well as academic books. But it was not until I went to sit with HH Sakya Trizen and heard him teach the Dharma [a book I had already read] that the Dharma awoke inside of me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 30th, 2016 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Śruta means hearing.

Queen Elizabeth II said:

True enough, yet in many modern Indian languages a person of great learning is called a bahuśruta, "one who has heard much" (e.g. Hindi बहुश्रुत and Gujarati બહુશ્રુત), no matter if he got that learning by reading books or by sitting at the feet of his guru. Is there any reason why in a Buddhist context the meaning of śruta should be strictly limited to things heard and that learning acquired by reading would not count as prajñā?

Malcolm wrote:

Such a person of great learning learned by sitting with their guru and orally reciting texts: first the ācārya gives a passage, indicating proper rhythm, tone, and so on, passage by passage, one at a time, and the student repeats it until it is memorized. Along with this, the meaning will be explained. Texts support this process, but by no means can they replace it. This kind of learning is fundamentally different than the sort of discursive

learning we prefer today. The invention of the printing press fundamentally changed the way Europeans related to texts and the process of learning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 30th, 2016 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As I have pointed out before: the three prajñās or wisdoms are hearing, reflection and meditation, not reading, reflection and meditation.

Queequeg said:

Well, there clearly is no consensus on this.

Malcolm wrote:

Śruta means hearing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 30th, 2016 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Choral version of Seven Line Prayer

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

OK, looks like we need a little more purification:

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing can purify this:

```
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: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 30th, 2016 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Queequeg said:

Because... it is?

Malcolm wrote:

One would assume then that merely by reading the PP sūtra, everyone would comprehend it instantly.

Queequeg said:

The Sutra text is a written record of the Discourse...

Does everyone who hears the discourse comprehend it instantly?

Having heard it, though, they've formed a bond that will mature into comprehension, maybe sooner, but probably later.

To tie this in with the Tiantai correspondence above, a person who hears (or reads) the Name, Prajna Paramita, would by that be drawn onto the path, irreversibly...

Malcolm wrote:

As I have pointed out before: the three prajñās or wisdoms are hearing, reflection and meditation, not reading, reflection and meditation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 30th, 2016 at 2:58 AM

Title: Re: Choral version of Seven Line Prayer

Content:

Taco_Rice said:

Thems your peeps, though.

<https://youtu.be/m8NlxYnO3JM?t=22s>

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, these be my peeps:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 30th, 2016 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Queequeg said:

Because... it is?

Malcolm wrote:

One would assume then that merely by reading the PP sūtra, everyone would comprehend it instantly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 30th, 2016 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Astus said:

Even in Tibetan iconography Manjusri holds a book as a representative of the PP teachings.

tomamundsen said:

In Tibetan iconography, Dharma books are a symbol representing the enlightened speech of the Buddha.

Malcolm wrote:

You have to understand, Astus does not care about lineages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 30th, 2016 at 2:19 AM

Title: Re: Choral version of Seven Line Prayer

Content:

Malcolm 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]
```

Really...we need a little less saccharine here and a little more spice....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 29th, 2016 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Choral version of Seven Line Prayer

Content:

Zhen Li said:

I personally don't mind the "world music" style that you hear from Imee Ooi, but the problem with that is that it isn't easy to replicate by, say, a choir or what have you.

dzogchungpa said:

I really like a lot of her stuff and in particular I find her rendition of the Vajra Guru mantra very moving:

```
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]
```

Admittedly, it doesn't swing.

Malcolm wrote:
Kitaro on prozac...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, January 29th, 2016 at 11:25 PM
Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?
Content:
Queequeg said:
The reason I raise this is because it seems that as one advances on the path, a teacher's role is limited...

Malcolm wrote:
Even bodhisattvas of the tenth bhumi have teachers.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, January 29th, 2016 at 11:24 PM
Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
the sūtra makes it clear that the doctrine of the PP must be heard from another.

Astus said:
The doctrine is contained in the sutra, and the sutra is a written text.

Malcolm wrote:
Sūtras are not written texts. This idea is at the heart of your misunderstanding. How can the PP, which is inexpressible, beyond thought and concepts be contained in a book?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, January 29th, 2016 at 1:19 PM
Title: Re: Choral version of Seven Line Prayer
Content:

ngodrup said:
Its maybe not well known, but Dungse Thinley Norbu Rinpoche was very fond of Gershwin's Porgy and Bess Classic "Summertime" and felt it was unfortunate that the song didn't have "dharma words." If it did, it would be all the more sublime.

Malcolm wrote:
His imagination was lacking, it is a perfect expression of anuyoga view: Summertime, and the livin' is easy

Fish are jumpin' and the cotton is high
Oh, your daddy's rich and your ma is good-lookin'
So hush little baby, Don't you cry

One of these mornings you're gonna rise up singing
And you'll spread your wings and you'll take to the sky
But 'til that morning, there ain't nothin' can harm you
With Daddy and Mammy standin' by

Summertime, and the livin' is easy
Fish are jumpin' and the cotton is high
Oh, your daddy's rich and your ma is good-lookin'
So hush little baby, Don't you cry

One of these mornings you're gonna rise up singing
And you'll spread your wings and you'll take to the sky
But 'til that morning, there ain't nothin' can harm you
With Daddy and Mammy standin' by

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 29th, 2016 at 12:28 PM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Astus said:

That's in chapter 14, not the colophon. Also, the sutra has existed as a book as far as we can tell, not to mention that its translations are definitely textual works. Plus the sutra itself makes it clear that one should read and copy it, just like other Mahayana scriptures recommend the same for themselves. Why make copies if one needs to hear it? And what difference does it make if one reads it on paper or listens to the same text read out?

Malcolm wrote:

It is meritorious to write it and copy it. Nevertheless, the sūtra makes it clear that the doctrine of the PP must be heard from another.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 29th, 2016 at 6:52 AM

Title: Re: Choral version of Seven Line Prayer

Content:

Punya said:

How so?

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, their pronunciation sucks.

Second, it's doesn't swing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 29th, 2016 at 5:32 AM

Title: Re: Choral version of Seven Line Prayer

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Possibly of interest:

```
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]
```

(hat tip to DJKR)

Malcolm wrote:

Horrible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 29th, 2016 at 5:09 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

Bakmoon said:

The other schools say that emptiness is much more than just the lack of inherent existence. It's about removing all views, most particularly the views of existence, non-existence, both, and neither.

Malcolm wrote:

This is because existence also cannot withstand ultimate analysis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 29th, 2016 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that even though he has a vision of the Tathāgatas before hand, he insists on finding Bodhisattva Dharmodgata to hear the PP directly from him.

Astus said:

That is a possible interpretation, not really emphasised in the sutra itself. However, it is stated repeatedly in this and other sutras that the scripture itself is the carrier and transmitter of the teaching - after the demise of Shakyamuni - worthier of veneration than relics.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you have not understood the colophons of this sūtra:

once he has heard the perfect wisdom, he follows and pursues the reciter of dharma and does not let him go, until he knows this perfection of wisdom by heart or has got it in the form of a book, just as a cow does not abandon her young calf"

"Hearing" requires hearing it from someone.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 29th, 2016 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Matt J said:

Classical Indian teachings tend to assume that three things are necessary for realization: 1) personal experience; 2) a teacher; and 3) scriptures. Why? The teacher prevents one from getting caught up in one's own delusions. The scriptures prevent the teachers from making up their own stuff. And personal experience prevents it from being a merely intellectual exercise.

A scripture simply can't tell you whether you're on the right track or not.

Astus said:

The teachings themselves are contained in the canon. At what point is a teacher indispensable?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, these are three of the four authorities. The fourth, which you omit here, is the intimate instructions. Ultimately, however, it is the guru that confirms the other three.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 29th, 2016 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

smcj said:

I think the Gelug version is that things are self-empty but they do arise interdependently.

Malcolm wrote:

Gelugs reject the appellation "rang stong", FYI.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 29th, 2016 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Astus said:

In that story, Sadaprarudita is told that the teaching will be either oral or scriptural:

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that even though he has a vision of the Tathāgatas before hand, he insists on finding Bodhisattva Dharmodgata to hear the PP directly from him.

Astus said:

Now that is something, although without context it is still not that clear. When it says mentor, is it kalyanamitra, upadhyaya, or something else?

Malcolm wrote:

Kalyanamitra, i.e. dge ba'i bshen gnyen

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 28th, 2016 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

...pretty much says a teacher is indispensable.

Astus said:

It's possible to read it that way.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, what it means is that you need a teacher. There are a ton of other citations that make the same point.

And, of course, there is the story of Sadaprarudita in the 8000 PP sūtra.

There is also the Ārya-kuśalamūla-paridhara-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

Never be separate from the Sangha,

never be separate from the virtuous mentor.

The Ārya-saṃghāṭi-sūtra-dharmaparyāya states:

When the virtuous mentor is seen, it is seeing the Tathāgata.

The Ārya-ratnākara-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra states:

In order to fully enter the dharmadhātu, one must rely on a virtuous mentor, associate with them and honor them.

This last one is basically the same in intention as Saraha's statement.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 28th, 2016 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Astus said:

I appreciate your quotes (as always), and I can only agree with them. However, they don't seem to say the indispensability of teachers.

Malcolm wrote:

should never be abandoned even at the cost of one's life
...pretty much says a teacher is indispensable.

Of course, as you note, in Vajrayāna, a teacher, it goes without saying, is definitely indispensable, as Saraha points out:

Ho, friends, the connate

can't be gained from another; it is gained from the mouth of the sublime guru.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 28th, 2016 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

Lukeinaz said:

I am wondering what is different about the Gelug presentation. Is it not harmonious with other traditions?

Malcolm wrote:

They insist that a negation is ultimate truth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 28th, 2016 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: All Buddhist traditions are oral traditions. Or...?

Content:

Astus said:

What I object to is this idea that an "authentic teacher" is somehow the key to everything.

Malcolm wrote:

Three Hundred Verses on Vinaya states: Disciplined, knows the rites of Vinaya, loving towards the ill, has a pure retinue, diligent in giving assistance with Dharma and materials, his instruction timely, such a guru is to be praised.

The Sutrālaṃkāra states: Rely on a virtuous mentor who is disciplined, peaceful, pacified, diligent in the highest qualities, very learned, understands the truth, eloquent, has a loving nature and has abandoned regret.

The Bodhicaryāvatara states: The virtuous mentor skilled in the meaning of Mahāyāna with the supreme disciplined conduct of a bodhisattva should never be abandoned even at the cost of one's life.

The Ratnāvali states: If you rely on those who are content, compassionate and disciplined, with the discerning wisdom that removes afflictions, through knowing them, give them respect.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 28th, 2016 at 2:30 AM

Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It just means that arising from conditions is a convention.

The consequence of Madhyamaka arguments is that things just happen, since existent causes and conditions are just non-causes and conditions, and past causes and conditions are just non-causes and conditions.

Queequeg said:

LOL

I'd say that's true of the duller folks who study Madhyamika... the ones who get lost in it precisely as they're warned not to.

They tend to emphasize the ultimacy of the analysis and ignore the remainder. Sad for them.

The remainder is what's interesting, IMHO. But you need to put the Madhyamika aside and utilize alternative methodologies for that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 27th, 2016 at 9:45 PM

Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The consequence of Madhyamaka arguments is that things just happen, since existent causes and conditions are just non-causes and conditions, and past causes and conditions are just non-causes and conditions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 26th, 2016 at 12:00 PM

Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Things are not real.

Things are not unreal.

...although it is appropriate to say things are not how we think they are, it is more appropriate to say that things cannot be successfully thought of from any ontological position.

smcj said:

OK, so far I'm with you.

To argue against an inherent essence of a given object, but then to argue for the existence as a form of process or continuum over time, or even as a plenum void, is internally contradictory.

I don't get that at all.

conebeckham said:

Okay...what process or continuum do you propose to be real? Let's examine this.

I like trees. Let's use the example of a tree. Now, we can say a tree does not exist-but can we say a tree, as process of seed-Seedling-sapling-tree-flower-fruit-seed, exists?

Or, if you don't like this example, what, exactly, can be said to exist?

Malcolm wrote:

Madhyamaka does not support process metaphysics. However, Yogacara does. Hence the debate.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 26th, 2016 at 5:45 AM

Title: Re: Having a body is like carrying around a sack of poison

Content:

Yeti said:

What about view? Where is it in this context?

Malcolm wrote:
No method, no view.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 26th, 2016 at 5:35 AM
Title: Re: Buddha-Nature is Change
Content:
Wayfarer said:
But I think "Buddha nature" ought to be put in quotes, or said with a wink.

Astus said:
Why?

Wayfarer said:
We don't want to be literalistic about such expressions. Otherwise you make a concept out of them, and then it becomes a matter of belief, like the kinds of ideas found in scholastic philosophy. And they're OK, in their own way, but they don't capture the living essence of Zen, which is ever elusive.

Malcolm wrote:
We can take the term tathāgatagarbha, etc. literally. Why? Because it is definitive in meaning. There is nothing interpretable about the statement in the Uttaratantra:
[E]mbodied beings are always buddha-natured.
And:
All migrating beings are said to be buddha-natured.
But we can take this out of the Zen forum.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 26th, 2016 at 4:43 AM
Title: Re: Having a body is like carrying around a sack of poison
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
No, it is more like the image in the sūtras of using the sewage of a city to grow crops.

The image of the lotus shows that samsara and nirvana are different.

The images of the pyre and fire and sewage and crops shows that nirvana is a transformation of samsara.

smcj said:
Right. And the point I've been trying to make is that if it is not transformed it is still samsara.

I do not see Larry Flynt or Hugh Hefner as Vajra Masters. What they are about, as understandable as it is, is not Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

They don't have a method. If they did, it would be different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 26th, 2016 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: Having a body is like carrying around a sack of poison

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Without the pyre of afflictions, how will the bonfire of pristine consciousness burn?

smcj said:

I see this as being similar to the analogy of the lotus flower rising unstained from the yuck and muck of the pond. YMMV.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is more like the image in the sūtras of using the sewage of a city to grow crops.

The image of the lotus shows that samsara and nirvana are different.

The images of the pyre and fire and sewage and crops shows that nirvana is a transformation of samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 26th, 2016 at 4:01 AM

Title: Re: Having a body is like carrying around a sack of poison

Content:

smcj said:

We definitely see things differently on this point. That's ok. There's more than one way to skin a cat.

Malcolm wrote:

Not in this case:

Without the pyre of afflictions, how will the bonfire of pristine consciousness burn?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 26th, 2016 at 3:09 AM

Title: Re: Having a body is like carrying around a sack of poison

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If the fire is hot enough, it can burn even the greenest of wood.

smcj said:

I still see your posting as supporting my position.

"No fire"= "defilement" and therefore obscuration.

"Fire"="wisdom", and therefore legitimate Vajrayana.

Malcolm wrote:

You are really missing the point:

No fire = no afflictions

Fire = afflictions

The statement is saying if there are no afflictions, there is no wisdom. Once the fuel [afflictions] is burned, the fire [wisdom] goes out

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 26th, 2016 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: Having a body is like carrying around a sack of poison

Content:

smcj said:

Most of my Vajryana teachers have been monks that kept their vows purely, and did so without seeing a contradiction.

Just sayin'...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, monks can practice Vajrayāna, and often take consorts, hence the term "gsang yum."

smcj said:

Back to your quote: Without the pyre of afflictions, how will the bonfire of pristine consciousness burn?

To belabor the metaphor, if the pyre is soaked with water it will not burn. Then it is still nothing but afflictions. The only scenario whereby a monk can take a consort without breaking his vow of celibacy is if the pyre is bone-dry (renunciation) and the fire burns as wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:

If the fire is hot enough, it can burn even the greenest of wood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 26th, 2016 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Having a body is like carrying around a sack of poison

Content:

smcj said:

Most of my Vajryana teachers have been monks that kept their vows purely, and did so without seeing a contradiction.

Just sayin'...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, monks can practice Vajrayāna, and often take consorts, hence the term "gsang yum."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 26th, 2016 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Having a body is like carrying around a sack of poison

Content:

smcj said:

But, having entered into Secret Mantra, we should never think of our bodies or sense enjoyments as impure.

But with an asterisk. My Gelug mentor told me that even in the Vajrayana the defilements are not to be indulged in per se. If they can be transmuted into wisdoms they are the means to enlightenment and therefore part of the Path. But if they remain as defilements they are still the source of suffering/dukkha.

He did not elaborate much beyond that, but my impression is that the Vajrayana still has "renunciation" as a premise. What it does not have is avoidance of anything in life--as long as it is lived with refuge, renunciation, and bodhicitta.

Malcolm wrote:

As Garab Dorje said:

Without the pyre of afflictions, how will the bonfire of pristine consciousness burn?

smcj said:

The Vajrayana is not a path Alister Crowley would have enjoyed.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, he most definitely would have, are you kidding me? Vajrayāna is not a path of renunciation at all. Recall, it started in this epoch because there was a king who needed to service 500 wives.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 26th, 2016 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Having a body is like carrying around a sack of poison

Content:

naljor said:

Malcolm, why then all those great Vajrayāna teachers teach Shantideva, why they don't teach Vajrayāna view from the beginning?

Malcolm wrote:

Many do, for example, ChNN. They just do not generally leave commentaries which become famous in Shedras.

And, you must bear in mind that Mahāyāna subjects are generally speaking subjects for kids and adolescents in Shedras. When we come to Tibetan Dharma as adults, there are many things we perhaps do not know at all and need to learn as context for Vajrayāna.

But, having entered into Secret Mantra, we should never think of our bodies or sense enjoyments as impure.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 26th, 2016 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sentient beings who are not conventionally deluded can certainly know who has their best interests at heart.

dzogchungpa said:

When it comes to politics, it often seems that one man's conventionally deluded sentient being is another man's conventionally undeluded sentient being.

Malcolm wrote:

Conventionally undeluded:

Conventionally deluded:

Just sayin...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 26th, 2016 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Having a body is like carrying around a sack of poison

Content:

Yeti said:

I've been taught that there are views of this according to the 3 yanas.

Hinayana - view this body as nothing desirable.

Mahayana - as a vehicle to use to take all beings to liberation

Vajrayana - as having the qualities of the kayas, and to be treated as such

As a 3 yanaist these views can all coexist together without conflict.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they actually cannot. Both Mahāyana and Hinayāna view the body as impure and something to be abandoned. Practicing in this way is a violation of Vajrayāna samaya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 26th, 2016 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

maybay said:

One could ask whether deluded sentient beings ever really know who has their best interests at heart.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on whether we are speaking about conventional delusion [seeing two moons in the sky] or ultimate delusion [not seeing the reality of their own nature].

Sentient beings who are not conventionally deluded can certainly know who has their best interests at heart. Since all sentient beings are ultimately deluded by definition, in this case, no politician can help them.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 26th, 2016 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

rachmiel said:

Procured, thanks.

Think I'll read Garfield and Tsöndrū side by side, see how they compare.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, Jay is very influenced by Gelug, and his reading pretty much ignores the classical tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 26th, 2016 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

maybay said:

Is it more important for politicians to be guileless and open with the electorate, or to have the best interests of the people at heart?

Malcolm wrote:

If they are not open with the people, how will the people know they have their best interests at heart, for example, the people of Flint, MI.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 26th, 2016 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Garfield elided the last part from his translation. It would be best if you used someone else translation. Garfield's is dated and quite inaccurate in many places.

rachmiel said:

What translation would you suggest? I'm interested in something that does not overlay a particular school-driven interpretation on the MMK, but strives to capture and communicate Nagarjuna's original intention.

Malcolm wrote:

Ornament Of Reason: The Great Commentary To Nagarjuna's Root Of The Middle Way

It is a pre-Gelug Tibetan commentary.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 25th, 2016 at 11:46 PM

Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?

Content:

Wayfarer said:

There is a difference between real and fake. If everything is fake, the ability to distinguish them collapses.

Malcolm wrote:

Hence, they are of one taste.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 25th, 2016 at 11:37 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

Norwegian said:

Here's Siderits & Katsura:

" I salute the Fully Enlightened One, the best of orators,
who taught the doctrine of dependent origination,
according to which there is neither cessation nor origination,
neither annihilation nor the eternal,
neither singularity nor plurality,
neither the coming nor the going [of any dharma, for the purpose of nirvana
characterized by] the auspicious cessation of hypostatization. "

Malcolm wrote:

Pretty dreadful as literature...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 25th, 2016 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: POTUS 2016

Content:

Arjan Dirkse said:

Basically Iraq would become a US colony.

Taco_Rice said:

Would the Iraqis really be worse off for it?

Malcolm wrote:

No, but we would.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 25th, 2016 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

rachmiel said:

Garfield's translation has a different ending:

I prostrate to the Perfect Buddha,
The best of teachers, who taught that
Whatever is dependently arisen is
Unceasing, unborn,

Unannihilated, not permanent,
Not coming, not going,
Without distinction, without identity,
And free from conceptual construction.

What does mangalam mean?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Garfield elided the last part from his translation. It would be best if you used someone else translation. Garfield's is dated and quite inaccurate in many places.

mangalam is the auspicious verse in the beginning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 25th, 2016 at 9:52 PM

Title: Re: empowerments and focus

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are rules, but in reality there are no rules.

Yeti said:

AFAIK, when the samaya is given at the end of the empowerment and it is said "The samaya is the view", then there is no specific practice commitment as such, and one unifies that practice with one's view (which to me is hugely challenging as practice).

But if a Vajra Master gives a specific practice commitment, then I see that as a literal instruction. It's not my domain to literally reinterpret that. (But one could always go to the VM as state why it's not possible to keep that practice commitment). I admire magnus for walking out of that Yamantaka empowerment... that's a sign of respect and perspective.

I was told after taking the Sakya Vajrakilaya that the standard Vajrakilaya mantra would not suffice for the recitation commitment, and that one was required to do that specific mantra.

I must confess I don't do a lot of various daily practices that many of my better vajra brothers and sisters do, but I've been taught these practices combine to effect ones tendrul and manifestation and auspicious connections.

In the case of many great masters they did many daily practices, and regular retreats on these different practices. In general, they are lineage holders, and myself, best to focus on the heart of the practice I'm focusing on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 25th, 2016 at 10:00 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

rachmiel said:

Ironically, the proper Madhyamakan response to my concern about causality is RIGHT THERE IN THE VERY OPENING OF THE FRICKIN' Madhyamakakarika:

1. Neither from itself nor from another,
Nor from both,
Nor without a cause,
Does anything whatever, anywhere arise.

Shame on me for having forgotten this! I only read it like 20 times (a year or so ago).
Forest for the trees ...

Malcolm wrote:

The opening mangalam of the MMK captures the entire meaning of the text:
I prostrate to the most sublime of teachers,
the Perfect Buddha,
by whom dependent origination —
not ceasing nor arising,
not annihilated nor permanent,
not going nor coming,
not different nor the same,
the pacification of proliferation — was demonstrated as peace.
If this is understood, the whole of the MMK will be understood with ease.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 25th, 2016 at 6:22 AM

Title: Re: empowerments and focus

Content:

Adamantine said:

Yeah but according to what you've been emphasizing, even if he had stayed he wouldn't need to practice that yidam as long as he was practicing an equivalent one daily or doing Guru Yoga daily, even if that contradicted what HH said at the time...

Malcolm wrote:

Correct. Why? Every time you take any empowerment into any deity, you are promising to take that deity as your yidam until you achieve awakening. So, when you have taken Dzogchen teachings, you should understand how to unify everything into one practice, and doing so fulfills all commitments. However, if you do not have this understanding, then it is better to be more judicious.

Of course, such instructions by HHDL, etc., are meant to discourage the merely curious.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 25th, 2016 at 5:04 AM

Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness implies conventional existence, not existence.

Jeff H said:

Fair enough. I agree with that. But is the correction you are giving me that conventional existence cannot be expressed as "existence" even when juxtaposed against the mistaken appearance of intrinsic existence?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 25th, 2016 at 4:15 AM

Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?

Content:

Jeff H said:

Not at all, Malcolm. But if the OP is asking for "simple and brief", I'm trying to share a starting point that may help. That sentence may have been overstated.

My point was in reference to phenomena, though. Conventional truth asks how things function in the world. Ultimate truth asks how they exist really. But both truths are referring to the same entity, and therefore emptiness implies existence -- just not intrinsic existence. Am I mistaken about that?

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness implies conventional existence, not existence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 25th, 2016 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: Sangha and harmony

Content:

Punya said:

What do you think Andreas means by "invigorating the clarity aspect"? And, is it reasonable to expect a live (not online) sangha to be peaceful or do you agree that this can be fake or only an outer appearance.

Malcolm wrote:

It means stimulating yourself so you do not fall into dullness or get carried away with agitation.

Punya said:

Thanks, that's not what I thought he was meaning. So when he says "They don't have that door open where the demons and the Buddha are come" what point is he making?

Malcolm wrote:

They never challenge their practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 25th, 2016 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: empowerments and focus

Content:

Adamantine said:

If that's the case, then why wouldn't the Dalai Lama who is clearly an expert on Atisha give that conditional at the time of the Yamantaka wang that Magnus left:

heart said:

I left an empowerment of Yamanataka by HHDL because he clearly told us at the beginning of the empowerment that everyone that didn't want to apply the practice for the rest of their life should leave.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Because he wants people to put it into practice seriously. If you are a Gelugpa, this is going to be either your main practice or one of them.

But if you start practicing Dzogchen, unless you are a Gelug lineage holder, what is the point of maintaining irrelevant yidam practices?

heart said:

I am imagining Magnus is quite familiar with the POV you express but left to honor HH Dalai Lama's own perspective as the lineage Guru giving the wang.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, he used his common sense. He was never going to seriously practice this deity, I am quite sure.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 25th, 2016 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: Sangha and harmony

Content:

Punya said:

What do you think Andreas means by "invigorating the clarity aspect"? And, is it reasonable to expect a live (not online) sangha to be peaceful or do you agree that this can be fake or only an outer appearance.

Malcolm wrote:

It means stimulating yourself so you do not fall into dullness or get carried away with agitation.

It can be fake.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 25th, 2016 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: empowerments and focus

Content:

narraboth said:

I've heard that someone has to do a deity practice from both Sakya and Gelug lineage everyday because he received both from different masters, even the practices are just a little bit different in details.

Malcolm wrote:

Then in this case they do not understand the principles of the teaching.

Adamantine said:

I believe in every case it is really dependent on the Guru and what they instruct. If they are asked and answer that it is important to do the Sakya practice as it's own daily commitment separately then it wouldn't be appropriate to take liberties with interpretation that contradict the Guru's own command. Of course that may not be the case here.

Malcolm wrote:

Quite honestly, this is not what all the great masters of the past have taught. This practice 1) comes from lower tantras. 2) it arises from lineage provincialism.

For example, while it is the case that Vajrabhairava and Yamantaka are separate lineages, etc., there is not point in practicing both. There is no point in practicing the Sakya and the Gelug transmissions of Naro Khachö separately. There is no point in practicing two different forms of Hevajra, Vajrakilaya, or Kalacakra.

The way to unify all commitments is in Guru Yoga. If you understand this, you understand the real point of the teachings.

It is said that when Atisha came to Tibet, he thought he had nothing really to share, until he noticed one day that Rinchen Zangpo was practicing different several mandalas a day. Then Atisha realized he had a purpose and advised Rinchen Zangpo (many years his senior) to focus on one mandala, commenting, "Tibetans practice one hundred

mandalas and realize none, whereas Indians practice one mandala and realize all."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 25th, 2016 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?

Content:

Jeff H said:

You can only apply emptiness to an existing phenomenon.

Malcolm wrote:

So according to you, space and cessations are not empty?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 25th, 2016 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

rachmiel said:

"Emptiness does not mean that nothing exists. It just means that any existence that phenomena have is as a result of causes and conditions and will cease when those causes and conditions no longer apply."

Malcolm wrote:

But you have to understand the Nāgārjuna clearly shows that such an account of phenomena arising through causes and conditions is incoherent.

There is a reason that the most important moment on the path of a bodhisattva is the understanding gained on the eighth bhumi, patience for the nonarising of phenomena.

The ultimate conclusion of Madhyamaka is that nothing arises, yet everything appears. E ma ho!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 24th, 2016 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: empowerments and focus

Content:

narraboth said:

I've heard that someone has to do a deity practice from both Sakya and Gelug lineage everyday because he received both from different masters, even the practices are just a little bit different in details.

Malcolm wrote:

Then in this case they do not understand the principles of the teaching.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 24th, 2016 at 4:19 AM

Title: Re: Namkhai Norbu and Vegetarianism

Content:

orgyen jigmed said:

Although it was not my intention here to either challenge Namkhai Norbu's scriptural authority, realization or capacity as a teacher, I nevertheless felt it appropriate to present only a small token of converging views on the ganachakra samaya substances, that are equally based on scholarly and siddhas realizations - but not necessarily embraced or readily understood by some Dzogchen followers of Namkhai Norbu.

Malcolm wrote:

Since you have decided to attack ChNN's students on this score and ChNN as well, it must be pointed out to you that they are merely following the explicit instructions of their guru.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 24th, 2016 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

TRC said:

This same basic theme that keeps on appearing on the Open Dharma forum with regular monotony

Malcolm wrote:

Theravada is not being run down. The point is to establish, as I have done, that Theravada falls within the bounds of Mahāyāna critiques. This, after all, is a Mahāyāna website. It is understandable that Mahāyānists will want to understand what the Mahāyāna point of view is, and not the inconsistent speculation and revisionism that streams out of western academia.

We Mahāyānistas have our own narratives about the origin and rise of Mahāyāna. On this forum, a Mahāyāna forum, I demand that this be respected.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 24th, 2016 at 1:34 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All modern research about the putative formation of Mahāyāna is at best speculative and there are very contradictory opinions in the scholarship.

TRC said:

Yes indeed and this is my point also; but it needs to be said emphatically that the view that Mahayana was taught simultaneously is in the minority.

Malcolm wrote:
Among westerners.

TRC said:
Now importantly, when this is considered, it changes the whole emphasis of debate dramatically and significantly towards the standing of Mahayana/Vajrayana, who would therefore no longer have any legitimacy as the arbiters of who is higher, who is lower and who's who in the world of Buddhadharma, and quite frankly IMO this is how it should be.

Malcolm wrote:
The classical Mahāyāna sūtras, and authors such as Nāgārjuna and Maitreyanatha, are the sole arbiters of what Mahāyāna considers lower paths and higher paths.

TRC said:
At the very best the most that could be said with any legitimacy is that they are different. Without being Buddhavacana the Mahayana/Vajrayana no longer has claim to being the self-appointed authority on these matters.

Malcolm wrote:
And here we have hit finally on the salient point of your disagreement. You do not think that Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna are Buddhavacana at all, thus, there is no common basis for a discussion.

TRC said:
I would suggest this is what most concerns you and why you are vehemently opposed to the majority of Scholarly opinion.

Malcolm wrote:
Western scholars generally speaking don't care whether any of it is Buddhavacana or not. They, in general, have no interest in practicing Dharma. They are not lineage holders of Mahāyāna Dharma.

TRC said:
It's not Reggie Ray's opinion (when he asserts that Mahayana is a later development), that is in the minority, it is actually yours. You may skilfully argue the contrary and convince many that it is the minority, but the facts don't bare it out.

Malcolm wrote:
In this conversation I had one main point, successfully presented, which states that the critiques and positions leveled against śrāvaka schools and paths in Mahāyāna apply just as much to Theravada as they do to Sarvastivāda, Mahāsaṃghika, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 24th, 2016 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

☞

Malcolm wrote:

Nice try.

dzogchungpa said:

Curses, foiled again!

Malcolm wrote:

Well, your attempt was rather "transparent."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 23rd, 2016 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

☞

Malcolm wrote:

Nice try.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 23rd, 2016 at 11:09 PM

Title: Re: empowerments and focus

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In my opinion, irrespective of this or that empowerment, special or not, as long as one remains interested in the path, than all of your samayas are intact, whether or not you do this or that visualization or chant this or that mantra.

Your vows are all rolled up in one question: are you interested in liberating yourself for the benefit of all sentient beings or not? If yes, then you have samaya. If not, then not.

There are acts which can break your path commitments, but these also can be restored. Vajrayāna samaya is not whips and chains.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 23rd, 2016 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: What's in simple, brief explanation, emptiness?

Content:

Ervin said:

I still don't quite know what is meant by emptiness in Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

It means things are not real.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 23rd, 2016 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The fact is that the Ray is wrong

TRC said:

The only fact evident here is that Reggie Ray disagrees with you. Nothing more. If you weren't so caught up in the dogma and rhetoric you might actually begin to consider that maybe you are not correct. Yours is just one point of view, not the final word.

Now, what else is interesting is your criticism of academics/scholars who study and interpret Buddhism, yet the basis of your arguments and your approach is also very scholarly and academic. So is it just the case that you only reserve criticism for them when they don't agree with you? Most obviously your criticism of Buddhist academics and scholars who conclude that Mahayana is a later development (Ray is also clearly saying this above) and that the historical Buddha was not teaching Mahayana/Vajrayana concurrently. I think your criticism reveals a clear double standard.

Malcolm wrote:

You are discussing two separate issues:

One, there is Ray's opinions about the formation of Mahāyāna. All modern research about the putative formation of Mahāyāna is at best speculative and there are very contradictory opinions in the scholarship. For example, no one takes Ray's thesis that Mahāyāna formed in South Indian forest dwelling ascetic communities seriously anymore.

The traditional Mahāyāna account however is clear: Mahāyāna was taught by the Buddha, Mahāyāna teachings were preserved by ārya bodhisattvas, and eventually, they were promulgated widely.

The second issue, where I think that Ray is really out to lunch, is his perspective on

Hinayāna: what the term means and to whom it applies. The basis of my argument about is the texts of the Mahāyāna tradition itself and the traditions it self-consciously identifies as objects of polemic, Sthaviravāda/Theravada being among them. Then of course there is irrefutable fact that people calling themselves "Theravadins" lay claim to being in fact the Sthaviravada tradition. As I pointed out, either there is a continuity of the Theravadin ordination lineage which goes back to Upali or there is not. If there is, there is no decent reason not to consider Theravada the modern representative of the Sthaviravādin tradition. That being the case, within the literature of the Pali Canon itself, the path of attaining Buddhahood, the practice of a bodhisattva, is nowhere taught. Therefore, in order to practice that path, aspirants must turn to Mahāyāna sūtras if they wish to have any hope of understanding how to practice that path beyond a vague notion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 23rd, 2016 at 1:24 AM

Title: Re: Samayasattva/Jnanasattva

Content:

smcj said:

HHST does not mean there is some wisdom or compassion "out there", disembodied, and free ranging. No, he means that there are buddhas.

He speaks English fluently, right?

Malcolm wrote:

His English is quite good.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 23rd, 2016 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Samayasattva/Jnanasattva

Content:

smcj said:

I saw a friend last night. He's been reading a Sakya book and quoted HHSK saying the following in that book.

From:

"Treasures of the Sakya Lineage; teachings from the masters" compiled by Migmar Tseten and published by Shambhala in 2008, on page 54.

Malcolm wrote:

And edited by yours truly.

HHST does not mean there is some wisdom or compassion "out there", disembodied, and free ranging. No, he means that there are buddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[quote="Bakmoon"]

Well no one is stopping you from taking up the Gelugpa interpretation of Madhyamaka which posits conventional existence. In that system statements like that by Buddhapalita are subject to interpretation.[quote]

Gelugs would reformulate it as follows.

"It is not that Madhyamaka negates existents, it merely removes claims for inherently existing existents."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 9:49 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

Conebeckham said:

The English terms "Absolute Truth" and "Conventional Truth" are not the best translations.

Wayfarer said:

I think they're quite intelligible and that there is a real distinction between conventional and ultimate.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the former is the object of a deluded cognition, the latter is the object of a non-deluded cognition. Please Candrakīrti's definition in the MAV.

Wayfarer said:

From the viewpoint of ultimate truth, there is no distinction - that's one of the implications of non-dualism - but for those who still are bound by conventional realities, the distinction is real and important.

Malcolm wrote:

It is important to know the difference between delusion and nondelusion, yes.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 11:59 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is resolved by what the Buddha says, they retain the knowledge obscuration because of traces they fail to eradicate. It is not the case that they have active afflictions. But they do not eliminate all traces and until they do, they still possess a knowledge obscuration, in addition to the fact that as the Buddha says, śrāvaka arhats and pratyekabuddhas do not realize the emptiness of phenomena, only the emptiness of persons.

Astus said:

What traces and where? Are those the effects of past deeds, what we can see (e.g. <http://www.buddhanet-de.net/ancient-buddhist-texts/English-Texts/Why-the-Buddha-Suffered/index.htm>) affecting the Buddha in the same way?

Knowledge obscuration is clinging to mental phenomena, dharmas that are within the skandhas. But if somebody is still bound by the skandhas, that is not liberation from samsara.

Malcolm wrote:

Astus, if you want to argue with the Buddha, Asanga, and Vasubandhu, go for it. I provided precise definitions for you, but if you still wish to invent your own, please continue without me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 6:34 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, your qualm directly contradicts the Buddha's statement in the Lanka that śrāvakas, pratyekabuddhas are liberated, but they have obscurations to full awakening.

Astus said:

I recognise it as well that there are contradictions. At the same time, the concept that sravakas are unbound (from attachment to skandhas) but still obscured (by conceptual attachments) is a contradiction in itself.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is resolved by what the Buddha says, they retain the knowledge obscuration because of traces they fail to eradicate. It is not the case that they have active afflictions. But they do not eliminate all traces and until they do, they still possess a knowledge obscuration, in addition to the fact that as the Buddha says, śrāvaka arhats and pratyekabuddhas do not realize the emptiness of phenomena, only the emptiness of persons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 6:31 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Caodemarte said:

It is not disingenuous to point out that the statement that Theravada was specifically criticised as a Hinayana school is lacking in evidence. It does lack evidence and what we have argues against it.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it does not lack evidence at all.

Caodemarte said:

If you establish what current Theravada doctrines actually are and what was criticised in the early polemics, then you can compare the two and make an argument that they would have been criticized if had they been around. However, this is a speculative argument, not an historical argument.

Malcolm wrote:

But they were around, for example, the Dipavamsa is circa third/fourth century. There is a clear continuity between the modern day Theravada and Sthaviravada.

You are claiming instead that there is one river called Sthaviravada which was interrupted, and then another river called Theravada in a different place. But if this is true, then Theravada ordinations are invalid since you are claiming there is no historical continuity.

Caodemarte said:

However, an historical argument has been made without historical evidence for it. The repeated creation of straw man arguments, throwing out red herrings, and intemperate language does not advance the discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

It is really simple: does the Theravadin ordination come from Upali or not? If it does, then cease complaining about whether the Mahāyana criticism of Sthaviravada also apply to Theravada -- for they do. If not, then you are left with the consequence that Theravada ordinations are invalid.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 6:26 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

<http://www.compassionateaction.info/ChapterFive.pdf> [/i]...

Malcolm wrote:

No, Zach did. I am quite sure that Chatral Rinpoche used a term like theg dman or theg pa chung ngu.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

Wayfarer said:

Much of this debate is caused by the fact that current English has no lexicon for degrees of reality or modes of existence; it has been 'flattened out'.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such lexicon in Sanskrit either.

There are no degrees of reality or existence. There is no state where something is partially real and partially unreal; partially true and partially false.

In order for one to be a nihilist, one has to assert something that becomes nothing. As stated, Madhyamaka does not claim things do not exist; it merely removes the claim that this and that thing exist.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 5:39 AM

Title: Re: Yangsi Kalu Rinpoche's Marriage

Content:

conebeckham said:

It's on Facebook.....frankly, I think that's where it should stay, IMO. I'm not interested in discussing it here. (or on FB, for that matter!). But whatever. If others want to discuss, within the bounds of our TOS, have at it.

Malcolm wrote:

Kids these days...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 5:28 AM

Title: Re: Saving all beings

Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:

Thank you for your replies. I will try to get at the gist of things in a general way, to avoid an overly long post.

My basic question is easier to frame now given the replies: How does a Buddhist work in

this life to save all beings?

Malcolm wrote:

By practicing the six or ten perfections.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 5:27 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

rachmiel said:

This would mean that one of the cornerstones of Buddhist dharma, dependent arising, is ultimately illusion. Ditto, I assume, for the other biggies: anicca, anatman, rebirth, etc. Dharmakaya too. Is anything not ultimately illusion?

Bakmoon said:

Precisely, all is illusory,

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Haribhadra states the path, including the attainment of buddhahood, is illusory from beginning to end.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

rachmiel said:

This would mean that one of the cornerstones of Buddhist dharma, dependent arising, is ultimately illusion. Ditto, I assume, for the other biggies: anicca, anatman, rebirth, etc. Dharmakaya too. Is anything not ultimately illusion?

Malcolm wrote:

Things are illusory because they are impermanent, lack self, etc. Dharmakāya is the ultimate realization of this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 5:05 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The fact is that the Ray is wrong, about this as he is about so many other things. He is here seriously dismissing the idea that Sarvastivāda is Hinayāna? Crazy.

dzogchungpa said:

Now, now Malcolm, there's no need to make Ray into an Aunt Sally. Here's another passage from the same book: Trungpa Rinpoche once expressed the view that within the Theravadin tradition over the course of its history, there were undoubtedly realized people who reflected a Mahayana and even a Vajrayana orientation. He also commented that within the historical Theravada there were probably realized siddhas (the Tantric Buddhist enlightened ideal).

CTR was a bit on the greeny-yallery side though.

Malcolm wrote:

There have been many thousands of Mulasarvativadins who reflect a Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna orientation, but not one single person among them was confused about the fact that Mulasarvastivada was, is, and always will be a Hinayāna school.

dzogchungpa said:

I think part of the problem here is that you seem to think these traditions are defined by books or tenets or whatever, and that is definitely not Ray's approach.

Malcolm wrote:

I think the problem is that people have not actually studied tenets, and so they really have not a single frickin clue what they are objecting to when they object to the fact that the Theravada sect, like the other 17 sects, is definitely included under the rubric of Hinayāna, as Chogyal Namkhai Norbu points out over and over again.

Instead, these days you have clueless nitwits who say "there are three vehicles, Theravada, Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna" and so on, like this clown:

<https://networkologies.wordpress.com/2012/04/07/knowning-your-buddhisms-distinguishing-the-vehicles-of-therevada-mahayana-vajrayana-and-beyond/>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 4:59 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

rachmiel said:

So if things are ultimately neither dependent nor independent ... what is the nature of the relationship between them?

Malcolm wrote:

Illusion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 4:55 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

smcj said:

This is totally wrong. "Other-emptiness"/gzhan dngos (Shentong) means being empty of anything other than its own (Buddha) Nature without being dependent upon anything else. Since Buddha Nature is beyond the conceptual process it is beyond Mahāyāna reasoning and therefore is not negated by it. Therefore it can be said to have true and absolute existence.

See: Khenpo Tsultrim "Progressive Stages of Meditation on Emptiness" page 66.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not utterly wrong. gzhan dngos is not a term for gzhan stong.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 3:37 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Caodemarte said:

Malcolm,

I did read the text you cite. It was very interesting and I thank you for it. When I said "Theravada was not included by name as one of the 18 schools." I meant to refer to the early Mahāyāna polemics, of course, and not to any text at all. That was my error.

Malcolm wrote:

If the Theravādins regard themselves as the heirs of the mantle of the Sthaviravadins, and the Sthaviravadins are explicitly mentioned in early Mahāyāna polemics, when the Ārya Sthaviravadins are mentioned for example, in the Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa, the Tarkajvala, The Yogacarabhūmi, the Mahāyānasamgraha [where a passage of theirs is cited concerning the bhavanga citta], or when Vasubandhu mentions the Sthaviravadins in the Vivṛtagūḍhārthapiṇḍavyākhyā (which contains a number of views of various śrāvaka schools) we can understand that this includes Theravada. Therefore, it is disingenuous to imagine that mainland Indian Mahāyānists were unaware of Sthaviravada/Theravada.

Caodemarte said:

It is likely that the Dīpavaṃsa's account was a portrayal of the situation at the time the Dīpavaṃsa or its sources was composed, when the Sri Lankan Mahāvihāra was in deep and protracted conflict with the Mahāsaṅghika schools. This situation was backdated to the time of the root split, providing mythic authority for the Mahāvihāra.

Malcolm wrote:

My reply to this is simple. When we examine the positions of Sthaviravadins that are discussed by Mahāyānists, we find they correspond precisely to ancient, middle as well as modern Theravada positions: for example, the nonexistence of the antarabhāva, the theory of the bhavanga consciousness (srid pa'i yan lag gi rnam par shes pa), etc.

And whether or not Theravadins were the REAL heirs to the Sthaviravada, they certainly imagined they were, and held to positions and continue to hold positions which are

clearly identified as Sthaviravadin in Mahāyāna polemical texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 2:00 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Asanga states in his commentary in the Uttaratantra: ...

Vasubandhu states in the Sūtra-ālaṃkāra, he states:

He provides a definition as well: That concept of the three wheels, is asserted as the knowledge obscuration.

Then of course there is the passages in the Lanka in which the Buddha states that due to not realizing selflessness in phenomena, śrāvaka arhats and pratyekabuddhas possess a knowledge obscuration.

Astus said:

All that are good and well. And in order to be obscured by agent-action-object and the emptiness of appearances one needs to maintain some attachment, an identification with the aggregates and sensory areas. So if such clinging is asserted in the sravakas, then they cannot even be called liberated, they are lost in some pseudo-nirvanic state (e.g. the apparitional city in ch. 7 of the Lotus Sutra). But if there is no such grasping, they cannot be obscured either.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, your qualm directly contradicts the Buddha's statement in the Lanka that śrāvakas, pratyekabuddhas are liberated, but they have obscurations to full awakening.

Liberation and full awakening are not the same thing. Thus, on the scale of pure, pure and impure, and pure, śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas belong to the second category, like bodhisattvas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He is translating the term parabhāva as "entity of difference." But this is a very strange translation. In this context, "para" means "dependent" or "other." He is here translating svabhāva, aka inherent existence, as essence. You could also translate parabhāva as "extrinsic existence," but the meaning is the same, i.e. one thing depends on another thing for its existence.

rachmiel said:

My Garfield translation of the MMK doesn't have this sentence. Nor can I find any commentary in the book that asserts dependent existence (Pratītyasamutpāda) to be a

gloss for inherent existence. In fact, Garfield repeatedly reminds us that Pratityasamutpāda ensures the lack of inherent existence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Caodemarte said:

Malcolm said, "Either Theravada identifies itself as one of the eighteen schools or not (it does). And if it does, then it is precisely what Mahāyāna authors such as Nāgārjuna and Maitreyanatha, etc., identify as 'Hināyāna.'"

Theravada was not included by name as one of the 18 schools. If anyone has evidence to the contrary, please publish.

Malcolm wrote:

I already pointed this out to you, but you missed it.

These 17 sects are schismatic,
only one is non-schismatic.
With the non-schismatic sect,
there are eighteen in all.
Like a great banyan tree,
the Theravāda is supreme,
The Dispensation of the Conqueror,
complete, without lack or excess.
The other sects arose
like thorns on the tree.

-- Dīpavaṃsa, 4.90–91 [Taken from Bhikkhu Sujato. Sects & Sectarianism: The Origins of Buddhist Schools. Santi Forest Monastery, 2006. p. i; http://santifm.org/santipada/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Sects__Sectarianism_Bhikkhu_Sujato.pdf]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It was addressed. I referred you to where you can find the Sarvastivadin discussions, as well as Agamic sources, for the idea that śrāvaka arhats and pratyekabuddhas possess a nonafflictive ignorance.

Astus said:

Anything in English? Also, the question I referred to is the reason for it, since generally it's the knowledge obscuration attributed to sravakas, but such obscuration can exist only if they have attachment to something, however, they are free from the skandhas

and dhatus, so there cannot be anything to be obscured by.

Malcolm wrote:

Asanga states in his commentary in the Uttaratantra:

Ordinary common people are impure because of the afflictive obscuration. Śrāvaka [arhats] and pratyekabuddhas are not separated from taints because of the knowledge obscuration.

In virtually the same words, Vasubandhu states in the Sūtra-alaṃkāra:

Ordinary common people are impure because of the afflictive obscuration. Śrāvaka [arhats] and pratyekabuddhas are not separated from taints because of the knowledge obscuration.

He provides a definition as well:

That concept of the three wheels,
is asserted as the knowledge obscuration.

Then of course there is the passages in the Lanka in which the Buddha states that due to not realizing selflessness in phenomena, śrāvaka arhats and pratyekabuddhas possess a knowledge obscuration.

Mahāmati, since all śrāvaka [arhats] and pratyekabuddhas do not realize the selflessness in phenomena and do not obtain the inconceivable peace due not abandoning the knowledge obscuration and the traces of karma obscuration, three vehicles are explained to śrāvakas, and not one vehicle.

And: Mahāmati, while the abandonment of the afflictive obscuration is not different for śrāvaka [arhats] and pratyekabuddhas because there is only one liberation, they do not abandon the knowledge obscuration.

Mahāmati, the knowledge obscuration is purified by seeing the selflessness in phenomena.

The one thing that never fails to amaze me is the presumption that we know Agamic Buddhism better than those who were raised in it, such as Nāgārjuna, Asanga and Vasubandhu. So when I see objections like yours, Astus, I just have to shake my head.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 12:21 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

muni said:

There is no disparity between appearances-emptiness. And that is the ultimate truth.

Malcolm wrote:

There is however a disparity between objects of deluded cognitions [relative truth] and objects of undeluded cognitions [ultimate truths]. In the former, the way things appear and the way things are not in accord. In the latter, the way things appear and the way things are in accord.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 22nd, 2016 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Keep in mind that here, Nāgārjuna has already demonstrated that dependent existence is merely a gloss for inherent existence.

rachmiel said:

Could you please provide a quote from the MMK of this demonstration, or tell me what passages to read (I have the Garfield translation)? Thanks!

Malcolm wrote:

It is all in chapter 15.

The inherent existence of dependent existence is what is called "dependent existence." It is the passage that immediately precedes the one I gave above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 21st, 2016 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

TRC said:

... however, not all Vajrayana practitioners hold this pernicious view. Here's Reggie Ray, on this very point, in his book *The Indestructible Truth* (2000) P.240:

"... 'Hīnayāna' refers to a critical but strictly limited set of views, practices, and results. The pre-Mahāyāna historical traditions such as the Theravāda are far richer, more complex, and more profound than the definition of 'Hīnayāna' would allow. ...The term 'Hīnayāna' is thus a stereotype that is useful in talking about a particular stage on the Tibetan Buddhist path, but it is really not appropriate to assume that the Tibetan definition of Hīnayāna identifies a venerable living tradition as the Theravāda or any other historical school ..."

It's worth quoting again, to see what one Vajrayana teacher of some prominence in the West, who is not locked into rigid old sectarian views and polemics, thinks. I'm sure there are others too.

Malcolm wrote:

Nice to see you so easily drop your intellectual standards, since you above claim that it is anachronistic to call Theravada "pre-Mahāyāna."

The fact is that the Ray is wrong, about this as he is about so many other things. He is here seriously dismissing the idea that Sarvastivāda is Hīnayāna? Crazy.

Either Theravada identifies itself as one of the eighteen schools or not (it does). And if it does, then it is precisely what Mahāyāna authors such as Nāgārjuna and Maitreyanatha, etc., identify as "Hīnayāna." Why? Because no path to Buddhahood is described in Nikayas/Agamas (one of Nāgārjuna's principle observations about the

Śravaka canon).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 21st, 2016 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

All this amounts to saying is that you have no confidence in any sources, apart from the ones you like and serve your exegetical purposes.

Astus said:

I think the technical term for that is discerning direct (nitārtha) from indirect (neyārtha). However, that does not address any of the raised issues, particularly the ignorance of arhats.

Malcolm wrote:

It was addressed. I referred you to where you can find the Sarvastivādin discussions, as well as Agamic sources, for the idea that śrāvaka arhats and pratyekabuddhas possess a nonafflictive ignorance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 21st, 2016 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhapālita states:

"It is not that we claim there are no existents; however, we remove claims for existing existents."

rachmiel said:

Sneaky! Wittgenstein would have had a field day deconstructing some of the more language-game passages of the *Madhyamakakārikā* ...

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a language game. Nāgārjuna states in the MMK [rendered in prose]:

Where is there an existent that is not included in inherent existence or dependent existence? If there is inherent existence or dependent existence, existents are established. However, if existents are not established, nonexistents will not be established.

Keep in mind that here, Nāgārjuna has already demonstrated that dependent existence is merely a gloss for inherent existence.

Author: Malcolm

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 ...

Malcolm wrote:

Conventional "truths" are not true. They are in fact the objects of mistaken cognitions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 21st, 2016 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

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 wrote:

This definitely does not correspond with Madhyamaka view. In Madhyamaka view, there is no reality.

rachmiel said:

Nagarjuna does not at all assert that there are no existents, rather that we misunderstand HOW existents actually exist (interdependently). I'm calling "how existents actually exist" reality.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhapalita states:

"It is not that we claim there are no existents; however, we remove claims for existing existents."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 21st, 2016 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

rachmiel said:

All we can ever see/know is phenomena; the noumena that "give birth" to these phenomena (in our minds) are forever beyond our seeing/knowing.

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 wrote:

This definitely does not correspond with Madhyamaka view. In Madhyamaka view, there is no reality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 21st, 2016 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Glad you have placed it on such a subjective basis.

Astus said:

When there are such stories on both disciples and the Buddha, then some treatises come up with a way to explain those events in one way and another, that is those author's interpretations. As for my side, such theories are neither well established nor balanced, although they certainly serve a purpose. And again, as I have mentioned before, this is the case of divergences in exegesis.

Malcolm wrote:

All this amounts to saying is that you have no confidence in any sources, apart from the ones you like and serve your exegetical purposes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 21st, 2016 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: John Canti, Wulstan Fletcher 2016 Khyentse Fellows

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Translators John Canti and Wulstan Fletcher of the Padmakara Translation Group were

awarded the 2016 Khyentse Foundation Fellowship, for their service to the
Buddhadharma:

<http://khyentsefoundation.org/2016/01/2016fellows/>

An interview with the fellows:

<http://khyentsefoundation.org/2016/01/conversation-with-2016-khyentse-fellows/>

Malcolm wrote:

Nice fellows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 21st, 2016 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

rachmiel said:

Three things that help me get the feel of emptiness:

No matter how much I think/feel that something exists "from its own side" ... all I'm really doing is assigning a symbolic name to a nameless phenomenon.

No-thing is as it seems.

All we can ever see/know is phenomena; the noumena that "give birth" to these phenomena (in our minds) are forever beyond our seeing/knowing.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no noumena.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 21st, 2016 at 12:07 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You can read the Agama citations which detail the non-afflictive ignorance of arhats and pratyekabuddhas in the Abhidharmakośaṭīkālakṣaṇānusāriṇ, etc.

Astus said:

Such a category can be used to exploit otherwise ordinary stories and claim that arhats are not that perfect. At the same time, similar events in the Buddha's biography can be found as well, but those are explained in a very different light.

But still the source of such ignorance is not explained. Or maybe it's the expectation of fantastic omniscience - beyond what logically can come from clear seeing of appearances - of a buddha that would need to be established. Otherwise, such stories can only fall into the category of parables.

Malcolm wrote:

Uhuh. So basically what you are saying is that if a source does not fit your preconceptions, it is a "parable" and does not conform to your notions of what is "logical."

Glad you have placed it on such a subjective basis.

In short, omniscience is not required for arhatship, indeed, none of the five mundane abhijñās are required. All that is required is that through seeing phenomena through the lens of the four noble truths, one relinquishes all ten fetters. That's all. In the Hināyāna teachings, only a buddha does this in one session, without a teacher to guide them. Arhats have a teacher to guide them, and generally gradually so. However, the same Hinayāna sources note there are severe restrictions on the knowledge of arhats like Maudgalyāyana which do not apply to a buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 20th, 2016 at 11:49 PM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

jundo cohen said:

I do not believe in birth and death

Malcolm wrote:

It happens to you whether you believe in it or not.

jundo cohen said:

Yes, I agree, Remove the mind created delusion and, like a house of cards, karma, affliction, birth and death and all the rest come tumbling down.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is, seeing into the delusion of birth and death does not mean that birth and death stops for everyone. It only stops for you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 20th, 2016 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Techno Yogi said:

Posters on Dharma Wheel may find the following resources to be helpful:

<http://www.budsas.org/ebud/ebdha126.htm> " by Ven. W. Rahula - this article explains the difference between a sect and a vehicle.

Malcolm wrote:

Pretty much a Theravada take on the bodhisattva path. It should be pointed out that there are serious differences between the bodhisattva taught by the Buddha in Mahāyāna, and the bodhisattva path which is described by commentators in Theravada.

Techno Yogi said:

" <https://www.buddhismuskunde.uni-hamburg.de/pdf/5-personen/analayo/hinayana.pdf> " by Ven. Analayo - this essay explores why it is anachronistic and incorrect to refer to Theravada as "Hinayana".

Malcolm wrote:

This essay depends on acceptance of the idea that there was no Mahāyāna at the time the Buddha was teaching in India. However, as we know, Maitreyanatha states in the Sūtra-ālaṃkāra that "Mahāyāna arose at the same time," meaning that Buddha taught Mahāyāna during the Early Buddhist period. Not only this, Agamic teachings are explicitly referred to in the Samdhinirmocana sūtra as the first turning of the wheel teachings, where as Mahāyāna teachings are referred to second and third turnings. Thus means that from a Mahāyāna point of view, Mahāyāna teachings existed during the early Buddhist period.

Techno Yogi said:

<http://dhammadharmawheel.com/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=10503&hilit=tantric+theravada> - a series of links exploring the reality of Theravada Buddhist practice in Asia, which incorporates a significant amount of mantra, visualization, energy work, and outright magic.

Malcolm wrote:

While indeed Vajrayāna was once practiced in all countries that are presently considered Theravadin, and even by people who were self-described Theravadins, what is described in these links is not Mantrayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 20th, 2016 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Neither arhats nor pratyekabuddhas are completely free from ignorance, only a buddha is

Astus said:

I meant in the Agamas, an arhat is completely free from ignorance, otherwise he would still be stuck in samsara. Of course, in a one vehicle approach, only a buddha is truly wise and free.

Arhats have ignorance, and this means they possess the knowledge obscuration. What are they ignorant of? Knowledge obscuration means being bound by the view of grasper and grasped, the concepts of agent, object, and action. They are free from

clinging to the five aggregates and the six sensory areas, so there is nobody to grasp anything. What is left then to be obscured by?

Malcolm wrote:

You can read the Agama citations which detail the non-afflictive ignorance of arhats and pratyekabuddhas in the Abhidharmakośaṭīkālakṣaṇānusāriṇ, etc. As an example, in the discussion of the nonafflictive ignorance which both śrāvaka arhats and pratyekabuddhas possess, the Buddha states in one passage:

All of the causes

in a single peacock feather

is not an object of knowledge for the one who is not omniscient,
but that can be known through the power of omniscience.

Other examples include Śariputra rejecting a candidate for ordination that Buddha later deemed suitable, and so on. These commentaries on the Kośha provide examples extracted from the Agamas which display the non-afflictive ignorance of arhats and pratyekabuddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 20th, 2016 at 9:34 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Astus said:

A stream-enterer is not yet free from ignorance, only an arhat is.

Malcolm wrote:

Neither arhats nor pratyekabuddhas are completely free from ignorance, only a buddha is,

As the Agamas teach freedom from appearances, and that means no obscurations, it is no different from realising buddha-nature.

This is your own fabrication. Arhats have ignorance, and this means they possess the knowledge obscuration.

BTW, when the Buddha says this or that is not realized by śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas do not realize this or that, "śrāvaka" here means śrāvaka arhats,

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 20th, 2016 at 3:13 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Rebirth is a product of delusion and ignorance in all Buddha's teachings. This is why the first link of the twelve fold chain of dependent origination is ignorance. The point is that as long as one is under the power of delusion and ignorance, for that long one will take

rebirth.

jundo cohen said:

That is why I am hoping you put all that ignorance down soon. This rebirth is of your own mental making!

Malcolm wrote:

Everything is made by mind, Jundo. This is why your active disbelief in rebirth is a little puzzling.

jundo cohen said:

We all have dualistic thinking, Jundo. Yours just happens to be grounded in a fundamental disbelief in the Buddha's core teachings (dependent origination, karma, rebirth, four kinds of realized persons, etc.).

I believe in all that! Just perhaps not as you do, and by seeing through the self-created dualisms that brings the shadows to life.

Malcolm wrote:

You believe in none of it. Do you know why the Buddha taught dependent origination, his motivation? It was to prevent people from asking him who they were in their past lives. So he said instead, based on affliction in a given continuum, there is karma, based on karma there is birth, if affliction is not eliminated, one will engage in karma, and if one engages in karma, suffering will result for that continuum until the end of time.

You believe that when you die, the terminus point of your mind is when your brain is dead. The Buddha described such a point of view as annihilationism (ucchedavāda). You see, there were whole schools of people in iron-age India, not followers of the Buddha, who hold your modern twentieth century belief that when the body dies, the mind dies with it.

All authentic Dharma teachings from Theravada to Dzogchen teach that based on affliction in a given continuum, there is karma, based on karma there is birth; if affliction is not eliminated, one will engage in karma, and if one engages in karma, suffering will result for that continuum until the end of time. The difference between all these schools, from Theravada to Dzogchen lay in the details of how this problem is approached and resolved, not in the essential problem itself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 20th, 2016 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Astus said:

it seems logical to me that the full knowledge of one requires the other two as well.

Malcolm wrote:

But it is not the case. For example, even Maudgalyayāna needed to ask the Buddha

where his mother had taken rebirth.

Astus said:

So for you, arhats, first stage bodhisattvas, buddhas and pratyekabuddhas all demonstrate precisely the same qualities and realization. If not, why not?

Yes, from the wisdom side of things that's exactly what should happen.

Malcolm wrote:

But again, it isn't the case. Why? Because if it were the case, than even hinayāna stream entrants should have the same realization as a buddha, but they do not.

Astus said:

It is possible to keep buddha-nature with a one-vehicle explanation, where every level is only a stage on the path to buddhahood. And in order to explain the historical problem raised here by many, it can be said that while the Agamas are not at fault or lacking, the way they were interpreted by some is incorrect, thus we see that Mahayana apologetics are against Abhidharmic ideas primarily. Similarly, in Tibetan Buddhism they find the sutra teachings somewhat deficient as they actually view them through a number of treatises (while, for instance in some Mahamudra works quoting sutras that match with the highest teaching is fine).

Malcolm wrote:

Or, the Agamas, as Nāgārjuna says very clearly, do not teach the path to Buddhahood, let alone buddhanature (which itself can only be seen by buddhas).

Mahāyāna sūtras provide details on a path that are not detailed in the Agamas. If they were detailed, the Mahāyāna sūtras would be unnecessary, not to mention the tantras and the Dzogchen tantras, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 20th, 2016 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Second, I happen to believe that he probably --did-- teach that as a man of Iron Age India, but that Buddha also taught (in Mahayana interpretation) that rebirth is a mind created nightmare that sentient beings need to see through. So, he also taught that rebirth is the product of delusion and ignorance.

Malcolm wrote:

Rebirth is a product of delusion and ignorance in all Buddha's teachings. This is why the first link of the twelve fold chain of dependent origination is ignorance. The point is that as long as one is under the power of delusion and ignorance, for that long one will take rebirth.

The fact that Buddha lived 2500 years ago is irrelevant.

jundo cohen said:

It may exist for you, Malcolm, because you believe in it and that you will be reborn, a product of your own dualistic thinking that you need to pierce.

Malcolm wrote:

We all have dualistic thinking, Jundo. Yours just happens to be grounded in a fundamental disbelief in the Buddha's core teachings (dependent origination, karma, rebirth, four kinds of realized persons, etc.).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 20th, 2016 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Yes, I also believe that you suffer an "utter lack of understanding of the Buddha's teachings"...

Malcolm wrote:

The difference is that the Buddha really did teach rebirth in samsara as the principle existential problem that sentient beings face, and I happen to agree with him. You don't. Thus, the main difference between us is that I support Buddha's core teachings, you don't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 20th, 2016 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Agamas/nikāyas teach leading a path of freedom, but not a path leading freedom and omniscience, the latter is found only in Mahāyāna.

Astus said:

Omniscience is not an attribute of the Buddha in the Agamas.

Malcolm wrote:

While this is not actually the case (that omniscience is not an attribute of the Buddha in the agamas), nevertheless, you are agreeing to the basic premise, i.e. that a path leading to omniscience is not found in the agamas.

Astus said:

As for Mahayana, omniscience is really just the prajnaparamita, not abiding in any dharma whatsoever.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not all omniscience is for Mahāyāna. There are two kinds of omniscience a buddha possesses: the omniscience of just how things are and the omniscience of all things that there are.

Astus said:

Furthermore, buddha-nature is completely revealed once there is no grasping at illusory appearances, and all possible buddha-qualities manifest. Since the Agamas teach not relying on any dharma, that should also mean the accomplishment of all attributes of perfect enlightenment.

Malcolm wrote:

So for you, arhats, first stage bodhisattvas, buddhas and pratyekabuddhas all demonstrate precisely the same qualities and realization. If not, why not?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Mother's Lap said:

Buddhist scholars or worldly scholars?

Malcolm wrote:

Classical scholars. But there is no consensus among them on this point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course they can, since they are a movement spread among several lineages, not just one, and they too base their ideas on statements uttered by the Buddha.

Not only do they take refuge in the Buddha, but they engage in the three trainings, śīla, samadhi, and prajñā.

Mother's Lap said:

So note no.225 isn't correct then?

<https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=LPMRr-V9BFQC&pg=PP1&pg=PA402#v=onepage&q&f=false>

Malcolm wrote:

The note is accurate, some scholars have this opinion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The terms Hinayāna, or Śrāvakyāna, are umbrella terms covering all kinds of points of view, from Pudgalavāda to Theravada.

Mother's Lap said:

Can Pudgalavada even be called shravakayana? Wouldn't they be "Buddhist by refuge" at best?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course they can, since they are a movement spread among several lineages, not just one, and they too base their ideas on statements uttered by the Buddha.

Not only do they take refuge in the Buddha, but they engage in the three trainings, śīla, samadhi, and prajñā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 10:52 PM

Title: Re: Stephen Batchelor - A Critique of "Buddhism Without Beliefs"

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Many folks in the Buddhist world (perhaps!!!) become upset with Batchelor because they see such beliefs as central and fundamental to Buddhism and their own personal beliefs. The reaction of many in the Buddhist world to such skepticism or denial is much the same as denying that the Bible is the literal word of God for some Christians. It is no surprise that folks get upset when their closely held religious beliefs are challenged.

Malcolm wrote:

No, no one is upset when people like you and Batchelor present your physicalist rejections of rebirth. Instead, we are saddened by your utter lack of understanding of the Buddha's teachings and in it, the central role of escaping rebirth.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Saving all beings

Content:

Monlam Tharchin said:

What does "saving all beings" actually mean to you, in terms we can all understand where we are now?

Malcolm wrote:

It is a virtuous aspiration, that is all. For example, the question is posed in by Shantideva, "How did the Bodhisattva perfect generosity without satisfying all sentient beings' needs and wants?" The answer Shantideva provides is that while the Bodhisattva did not have the capacity to satisfy all sentient beings' needs and wants, he sincerely wished to. It is developing that spirit of generosity that perfects generosity, not whether one actually has anything to give.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

TRC said:

I know you were quoting CTR Simon, but the points still stand. In fact your erroneous first statement is all founded on a self-view too as well as clinging to rights and rituals. These would no longer arise at stream entry.

I notice Dan was making pretty much the same points as I was writing my reply.

I have to add these are typical misrepresentations of the path expounded in early Buddhism. On these gross misunderstandings (most typical in Vajrayana) the Mahayana can't be trusted to define what Theravada is.

Malcolm wrote:

The terms Hinayāna, or Śrāvakyāna, are umbrella terms covering all kinds of points of view, from Pudgalavāda to Theravada. There are many tenets which belong to various Hinayāna schools. For example, Nāgārjuna negates the Theravadin theory of karma in the MMK.

It is not the case that Hinayāna is some monolithic entity when it comes to tenets. However, it is monolithic with respect to its goals, arhatship as opposed to buddhahood. Why? It conceives of buddhahood as being merely a special kind of arhatship, attained by special kind of person, a bodhisattva, who hasn't even an inkling of awakening until his final birth in which he attains buddhahood. A buddha must be a "he," since in all Śrāvākayāna schools there is no chance that a woman can become a buddha, even though she can become an arhat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Dan74 said:

Is it? In Dhammapada, the Buddha says: Just as a bubble may be seen,
just as a faint mirage,
so should the world be viewed

Astus said:

If we analyse a bit deeper than just repeating over and over the same things
(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kQFKtl6gn9Y>) of superior or not, then it can be
clear that on the wisdom side of things the Agamas teach the same complete freedom
as any Mahayana or Vajrayana path (see
<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=19609> and
<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=39&t=21768>). However, it should also be
recognised that the bodhisattva path is more extensive when it comes to other aspects,
particularly the ability to teach beings, as that's the main quality a buddha has to
possess. And when I say extensive, it doesn't mean one cannot find those qualities in
arhats, but they are not requirements.

Malcolm wrote:

The Agamas/nikāyas teach a path leading to freedom, but not a path leading to freedom
and omniscience, the latter is found only in Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 6:23 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

and how did he describe what it was like?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, in his Vajra Tantra and many other places.

gad rgyangs said:

and he said....?

Malcolm wrote:

You can read these things for yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:
and how did he describe what it was like?

Malcolm wrote:
Sure, in his Vajra Tantra and many other places.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 6:07 AM
Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
I think you may have missed the memo. There's a fifth vision now.

Malcolm wrote:
No, that is a Bonpo thing where they split up one of the four visions into two parts.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 5:49 AM
Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
As for producing someone who claims to have done so, I can point to the late Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, who indeed claimed to have experienced the fruit of the Mahāyāna path in his lifetime.

gad rgyangs said:
He actually claimed to be a fully awakened Buddha? I thought Maitreya was going to be the next one.

Malcolm wrote:
He reached the end of the fourth vision. That is buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 5:29 AM
Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?
Content:
Simon E. said:
They might even get to #3 Malcolm before feeling too unsettled .

Malcolm wrote:
Oh, you mean this one:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=48&t=2916&p=30739#p30739>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: What is faith?

Content:

Astus said:

That is actually what accepting on faith is: trusting in what others say without gaining an understanding on one's own.

SpinyNorman said:

But that only goes so far. Sooner or later there is a need to develop personal confidence through experience.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and the fastest way to do that is to practice Dzogchen. Everything else is much slower and far more indirect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Dan74 said:

If Malcolm came to ZFI and offered his view on things...

Malcolm wrote:

...people would freak out.

Simon E. said:

For some reason this set my mind imagining Malcolm on 'New Buddhist'....

Malcolm wrote:

They can come here and read my 16K + posts, and revel in the inconsistent glory that I have become.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 5:14 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not circular reasoning, any more is it circular reasoning to accept a car

functions on the basis of its definitions.

gad rgyangs said:

the existence of a car is demonstrated by getting in one and driving, which we have done. Neither you nor I have experienced ourselves as a Buddha, nor can you produce anyone who claims to have done so. Otherwise just because you define a unicorn as a horse with one horn doesn't mean that they exist.

Johnny Dangerous said:

If you cannot accept the premise that Buddhas arise and teach, what value are Buddhist teachings to you, and why?

Malcolm wrote:

This is just what Dante does between guitar lessons, just as this is what I do between pecha pages. It is serious on the one hand, but not so serious on the other.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 5:12 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not circular reasoning, any more is it circular reasoning to accept a car functions on the basis of its definitions.

gad rgyangs said:

the existence of a car is demonstrated by getting in one and driving, which we have done. Neither you nor I have experienced ourselves as a Buddha, nor can you produce anyone who claims to have done so.

Malcolm wrote:

Neither you nor I have gotten into a space shuttle, and yet we both accept they exist.

As for producing someone who claims to have done so, I can point to the late Kunzang Dechen Lingpa, who indeed claimed to have experienced the fruit of the Mahāyāna path in his lifetime.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 5:10 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Dan74 said:

If Malcolm came to ZFI and offered his view on things...

Malcolm wrote:
...people would freak out.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 4:49 AM
Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
A Buddha is a conventional entity around which definitions are constructed. The question is, "Are those definitions functional?"

If you argue that they are, then you are accepting the Buddha as defined. If you argue that they are not, then you are rejecting a Buddha as defined.

Since there is no other place to discover the definition of a Buddha other than texts and people who describe a buddha in this way and that, there is no way to establish what a Buddha is in absence of authority, since an authority is needed to provide a conventional definition of what a Buddha is.

For example, though Dharmakirti tries to do this, ultimately he fails because he has to rely on the definition of a Buddha provided in Buddhist texts.

gad rgyangs said:
[ouroboros-1.jpg](#)

Malcolm wrote:
No, this is not circular reasoning, any more is it circular reasoning to accept a car functions on the basis of its definitions.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 4:27 AM
Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?
Content:

Dan74 said:
Do you need to believe, if you can see? Moreover, the belief can interfere with the seeing, if handled unwisely.

Malcolm wrote:
Well Dan, you know what they say, "Seeing is believing."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 4:15 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

how are you be able to say that the result of mahayana is superior?

Malcolm wrote:

Through reasoning and inference.

gad rgyangs said:

actually lets start with something simplier:

can you, through reasoning and inference, and without appeal to authority, establish that there is such a thing as a "Buddha", i.e. someone who has attained the kind of result that you claim the mahayana texts present?

Malcolm wrote:

A Buddha is a conventional entity around which definitions are constructed. The question is, "Are those definitions functional?"

If you argue that they are, then you are accepting the Buddha as defined. If you argue that they are not, then you are rejecting a Buddha as defined.

Since there is no other place to discover the definition of a Buddha other than texts and people who describe a buddha in this way and that, there is no way to establish what a Buddha is in absence of authority, since an authority is needed to provide a conventional definition of what a Buddha is.

For example, though Dharmakirti tries to do this, ultimately he fails because he has to rely on the definition of a Buddha provided in Buddhist texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Well, that's fine. I will say that, IMO, "the Mahayana" is not some monolithic thing you either have confidence in or not, and part of the problem with insisting on "The Buddha" as it's unique source is that it tends to foster the opposite idea.

Malcolm wrote:

Consistently we have pointed to the sources for Mahāyāna being the Buddha, Nāgārjuna and Maitreyanatha. Actually, what we call Mahāyāna now is largely a product

of the Maitreyan synthesis.

dzogchungpa said:

Oh? So is it a monolithic thing you either have confidence in or not?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes (apart from differences in opinion over matter of the view of emptiness between Yogacara and Madhyamaka).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Well, that's fine. I will say that, IMO, "the Mahayana" is not some monolithic thing you either have confidence in or not, and part of the problem with insisting on "The Buddha" as it's unique source is that it tends to foster the opposite idea.

Malcolm wrote:

Consistently we have pointed to the sources for Mahāyāna being the Buddha, Nāgārjuna and Maitreyanatha. Actually, what we call Mahāyāna now is largely a product of the Maitreyan synthesis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 3:32 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

I don't think fence sitters are awful, it just seems like people want to have their cake and eat it too, to simultaneously practice the Mahayana while having no real confidence in it. People can be whatever they want to be, in the truest sense...it just seems like a confused, and borderline dishonest approach to me. Beyond that, a few people have even indicated that somehow they think fence sitting is productive practice, or even an integral part of Dharma practice. I'm not trying to play with credentials or anything, just going off what people are saying, and there are some big holes in this notion of vague skepticism being equated with some kind of inquiry.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, that's fine. I will say that, IMO, "the Mahayana" is not some monolithic thing you either have confidence in or not, and part of the problem with insisting on "The Buddha" as it's unique source is that it tends to foster the opposite idea.

BTW, I've found you can do some fairly high quality sitting on fences. It's just a question of balance.

Malcolm wrote:
Here's to high quality fence sitting:

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 2:20 AM
Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
That's the whole point of listening to The Buddha, once you have decided he is The Buddha...

Malcolm wrote:
That is the point — there are fence sitters who don't really think Mahāyāna is the teaching of the Buddha, even though they like Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna teachings.

dzogchungpa said:
Fence sitters are really terrible, aren't they?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, awful people....

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 2:06 AM
Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?
Content:
Johnny Dangerous said:
That's the whole point of listening to The Buddha, once you have decided he is The Buddha...

Malcolm wrote:
That is the point — there are fence sitters who don't really think Mahāyāna is the teaching of the Buddha, even though they like Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna teachings. They basically accept (without any nuance) the Western view that the Buddha's "original" teachings are those contained in the Pali Canon/Agamas. They do not contend the general thrust of Buddhist text critical studies at all. They really have no confidence in Mahāyāna teachings because at the end of the day, they do not believe the Mahāyāna was the Buddha's teaching. For them, there is no issue of whether or not Theravada is Hinayāna because for them there is no Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 1:46 AM
Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?
Content:
dzogchungpa said:

Examining the teachings IS practice, or at least could be.

Malcolm wrote:

I am quite sure that JD knows that reflecting on the teachings is part of practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

how are you be able to say that the result of mahayana is superior?

Malcolm wrote:

Through reasoning and inference.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 12:33 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In other words, I think the ideas in the Mahāyāna sūtras, in general, are better than the ideas in Hinayāna sūtras, etc.

dzogchungpa said:

Right, so why bother trying to pretend that the ideas in the Mahāyāna sūtras are the teachings of one particular person?

Is that too challenging?

Malcolm wrote:

I credit the ideas in Mahāyāna sūtras to the person to whom they are credited in Mahāyāna sūtras, i.e., the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Did it ever occur to you that the reason I do so is precisely because I have judged the ideas on their own merits? In other words, I think the ideas in the Mahāyāna sūtras, in general, are better than the ideas in Hinayāna sūtras, etc.

gad rgyangs said:

I see instead judgment of the Theravada as incomplete or inferior based on the fact that the mahayana texts say so rather than any demonstration that can be supported without appeal to authority.

Malcolm wrote:

Theravada is a śrāvakayāna path.

The question centers not around whether Mahāyāna judgements about Śrāvakayāna paths are valid — that is an entirely separate question — the question centers around whether the Theravada path matches the criteria set out in Mahāyāna Sūtras for such a path, and the answer, as far as I am concerned, is yes.

The question of superiority or inferiority can only be answered by an analysis of view and practice. In my opinion, the view, meditation and result of Mahāyāna is in every way superior to that of any śravaka school — but hey, that is just me. Everyone has to come up with that answer based on their own study and practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 19th, 2016 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so what is the ultimate authority of texts with such an origin?

Malcolm wrote:

Why, the community that observes them.

It is pretty hard to consider oneself a Mahāyāna practitioner if one does not consider Mahāyāna sūtras authoritative for one's view and practice.

gad rgyangs said:

and why would you consider texts that are, by your own admission, "edited, formalized, formatted, sanitized and generally prepared for an audience" authoritative at all? Its not that the sutras are not of interest or don't contain interesting ideas. The problem is when one set of texts are arbitrarily considered "authoritative" then other texts are by definition considered false, mistaken or "provisional". Buddhism is not the only tradition that has wasted time and energy arguing about what is authoritative on arbitrary grounds (usually appeals to mythological sources for the texts). All religious traditions do this. But in the West since the 17th century we have developed the idea of judging ideas on their own merits without appeals to authority. This seems to me to be progress in awakening, which is what Buddhism purports to be the goal. Ironically, even the Buddha is portrayed as discouraging his followers from blind adherence to his teachings and that they should rather test them on their own merits and not simply appeal to

authority.

Malcolm wrote:

Did it ever occur to you that the reason I do so is precisely because I have judged the ideas on their own merits? In other words, I think the ideas in the Mahāyāna sūtras, in general, are better than the ideas in Hinayāna sūtras, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 18th, 2016 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so what is the ultimate authority of texts with such an origin?

Malcolm wrote:

Why, the community that observes them.

It is pretty hard to consider oneself a Mahāyāna practitioner if one does not consider Mahāyāna sūtras authoritative for one's view and practice.

For myself, I use a hierarchical approach:

Where Mahāyāna sūtras contradict Hinayāna Sūtras, I follow the former.

Where Vajrayāna tantras contradict Mahāyāna Sūtras, I follow the former.

Where higher tantras contradict lower tantras, I follow the former.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 18th, 2016 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

. So, while Malcolm will give you all kinds of reasons why the mahayana polemic about Theravada being an incomplete path is actually true...

Malcolm wrote:

They are not my polemics. They are critiques made by the Buddha in Mahāyāna sūtras, and following them, Nāgārjuna and Maitreyanatha.

People are free, and they can make up their own minds, gurus or not. But they should be properly informed, and the point of view that holds that Theravada is immune from being considered an exemplar of Śrāvakayāna, aka Hinayāna, by the criteria laid out in Mahāyāna texts is quite simple misinformed.

There is these days a species of Buddhist Correctness however, which misguidedly tries to claim that the path of an arhat is just the same as the path of a bodhisattva, no better, no worse, just "different" (whatever that means) even though Theravadins by and large have abandoned the idea that it is possible to become an arhat — examples of this anecdotally exist in Tibet, where Vajrayāna practitioners who lack Mahāyāna bodhicitta still manage to eliminate their afflictive obscuration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 18th, 2016 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Removing Obscurations

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

it does not remove the knowledge obscuration.

Astus said:

How do you define knowledge obscuration?

Malcolm wrote:

See the Abhisamaya-ālamkara, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 18th, 2016 at 12:20 AM

Title: Re: Removing Obscurations

Content:

Astus said:

This is a topic raised by the question

(<http://dharma wheel.net/viewtopic.php?p=320501#p320501>) of whether freedom from attachments equals realising buddha-nature. Please tell if you agree or disagree and why.

Malcolm wrote:

Freedom from attachment only removes the afflictive obscuration, it does not remove the knowledge obscuration.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 18th, 2016 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Anyone who does not believe that one can become a Buddha, that only special people like Gotama Buddha have that capacity, that it is better to eliminate birth through eradicating afflictions right now, rather than embarking on the harrowing path of full buddhahood.

gad rgyangs said:

But why would anyone believe that if they heard the mahayana teachings? as we have seen, everybody in the sangha heard all the teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

And as we see, not everyone was capable of accepting what they heard. BTW, do you think that in Mahāyāna sūtras, *evam maya srutam ekasmin* is spoken by Ananda? No.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 18th, 2016 at 12:14 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Anyone who does not believe that one can become a Buddha, that only special people like Gotama Buddha have that capacity, that it is better to eliminate birth through eradicating afflictions right now, rather than embarking on the harrowing path of full buddhahood.

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, in all seriousness, do you really believe in the harrowing path of full buddhahood? Not as some kind of pro tem Mahayana polemicist, but as a practitioner, particularly a dzogchenpa?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, of course. Without the Vajrayāna path, it is the only possible way to become a buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 18th, 2016 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

for example, the PP in 8000 lines speaks at the beginning of " a great gathering of monks, with 1200 monks, all of the Arhats..." etc. In other words everybody was there. So explain to me how, after that, the teachings would be rejected by enough of those there that there would be no mention of them at all in the Pali canon?

If the various early canons have all come down to us in fragmentary state, then you would expect a random mix of teachings, both shravaka and mahayana. This is obviously not the case. The pali canon has only non-mahayana sutras. how do you propose to explain this?

Malcolm wrote:

Dante:

Everything written down in a book is edited, formalized, formatted, sanitized and generally prepared for an audience.

This applies to all Buddhist canons, not just the Mahāyāna canon.

Secondly, in the Pali Canon itself it details the fact that Buddha would put on disguises and go and teach various things to various people, devas and so on.

Third, why do you assume the reports about the proceedings of the first council are factual?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 17th, 2016 at 11:57 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I just don't buy the idea that the Buddha taught a hobbled version of the Dharma that is what is preserved in Theravada, and a complete version that is preserved in mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dharma found in the Agamas and Nikayas is not incomplete if your goal is to become an arhat. It is incomplete with respect to how one becomes a buddha. This is both Nāgārjuna and Maitreyanatha's point.

gad rgyangs said:

who says "I don't want to become enlightened like the Buddha, I just wanna be an Arhat"?

Malcolm wrote:

Anyone who does not believe that one can become a Buddha, that only special people like Gotama Buddha have that capacity, that it is better to eliminate birth through eradicating afflictions right now, rather than embarking on the harrowing path of full buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 17th, 2016 at 11:54 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Dan74 said:

As regards Theravada, I've seen precious little understanding of what Theravada does or does not teach here and elsewhere in Mahayana/Vajrayana circles and much misunderstanding. Just like I've seen plenty of misunderstanding of Mahayana/Vajrayana among Theravadins. That's why I suggested earlier in the thread, that if one is genuinely interested in Theravada-related questions, it is best to turn to Theravada sources and teachers.

Malcolm wrote:

Dan, the Theravada teachings are not some mysterious "other." Many of us here have studied Theravadin and other Śrāvakayāna teachings in quite a great bit of detail. Many of us here have read in detail and extensively all the Pali Canon translations that are available both from Bhikku Bodhi and the PTS. The sum total of all classical Theravada meditation practices can be found in the Visuddhimagga, and they are little different than their counterparts in Sarvastivadin Abhidharma. We all share the 37 bodhipakṣa dharmas, the five skandas, the three afflictions, various schemes of dependent origination, and so on. We all share the common ideas about stream entry, etc. So you see, many of us have done our homework and checked into these sources.

The differences lie mainly not between the Sarvastivada and Theravada employment of these key concepts, the difference is that in Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna these ideas are treated a little differently. Nevertheless, Mahāyāna too is grounded in these key concepts.

Another point is that the meditation practice tradition in Theravada is largely reconstituted from books. It was revived, and does not have a living continuous tradition as in Tibetan Buddhism, Zen and so on. Indeed, Theravada for many centuries even seems to have given up the idea that arhatship is possible, though, in the 20th century it appeared that this skepticism was partly reversed. In Mahāyāna, it has never been the case that we have ever given up the idea that awakening and even buddhahood is possible.

The usual contested "misunderstanding" is the Mahāyāna assertion that the path of buddhahood does not exist in the Agamas/Nikayas. Well, it does not. It does not matter if there are such texts as the Buddhavamsa and so on. Texts such as these are hagiographies, not manuals for practice. Mahāyāna sūtras cover many topics, but their central concern is describing the bodhisattva path, which is distinct from the arhat path.

There is another point — anyone who is a Theravadin can follow Mahāyāna by properly taking the bodhisattva vow if they so choose, just as many Mahāsamghikas, Sarvastivādins, Dharmaguptakas, Mulasarvastivadins and so on have. They can also follow Vajrayāna if they so choose. Some people seem to think that Theravada is the only active Śrāvakayāna school left, but it is not true.

Sarvastivada abhidharma ideas, such as the six causes and four conditions actively permeate even Dzogchen teachings. Whole mandalas are constructed on the basis of the thirty-seven bodhisapaksa dharmas, such as the mandala of Cakrasamvara.

Śrāvakayāna teachings form the backbone of Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna, but the goal put forward in those teachings is limited in its scope since they concern only achieving liberation for oneself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 17th, 2016 at 11:27 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

I just don't buy the idea that the Buddha taught a hobbled version of the Dharma that is what is preserved in Theravada, and a complete version that is preserved in mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dharma found in the Agamas and Nikayas is not incomplete if your goal is to become a arhat. It is incomplete with respect to how one becomes a buddha. This is both Nāgārjuna and Maitreyanatha's point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 17th, 2016 at 11:24 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

TRC said:

To further verify that the Buddha didn't hold back a different set of teachings, he categorically states this in the <http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/dn/dn.16.1-6.vaji.html>

Malcolm wrote:

No, but he clearly parceled out different teachings to different kinds of students, for example, teaching the Kalamas only about the four brahma-viharas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 17th, 2016 at 11:17 PM

Title: Re: Lungta

Content:

Adamantine said:

It is fine to commission someone to hang flags for you: it is important they are consecrated by a qualified Lama with mantra, sometimes done during a sang ceremony, first however.

Malcolm wrote:

No, you can consecrate them yourself. But if you think some lamas blessing is more potent, go for it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 17th, 2016 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: The posture

Content:

tingdzin said:

Too, your own cultural chauvinism may be sufficient reason to reject thousands of years of Asian lore about physiology in one fell swoop, but your remark also shows that you are completely unfamiliar with Western psychological research on the hemispherical functioning of the brain that shows the brain's two sides do indeed have complementary functions, which do, indeed, play out in human psychophysical activity.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you do have to bear in mind that Jundo's teacher thinks the goal of seated practice is to cause a spontaneous alignment of the vertebrae of the spinal column resulting in a balanced "body-mind" which, according to him, is the essence of Soto practice. Here is his own summary of his theory of Zazen:

When he was 29 years old he left the palace in search of the meaning of life, and after several years, when he was 35 or 36, after adopting a simple method of physical practice that balanced his body and mind, he discovered what he had been searching for; he found that the world exists just at this time and in this place, and that the whole universe is splendid just as it is. For many years he taught his disciples about the simple practice and what it meant as the essential truth that all human beings should know. Gautama Buddha was not a god, but a man. And he taught that we can all return to our original state, which is serene and peace-ful. His teachings are not spiritual, but essentially humanistic; with this simple practice we can all attain our perfection as human beings.

And:

What do we experience in Zazen?

Zazen is the simplest form of action, and when we are practicing Zazen we do not intentionally think about anything or concentrate on our feelings and perceptions. We sit in a simple nondiscriminating state where our body-and-mind are balanced and undivided. However, in order to discuss the state in Zazen we cannot avoid making divisions and categorizations. In spite of these categorizations, the actual experience of Zazen remains a wholistic one.

We can describe four aspects in the practice of Zazen. They are: 1) Different from thinking; 2) Making the body right; 3) Oneness of body-and-mind; and 4) Oneness with the Universe.

1. Different from Thinking

The state in Zazen is without intention and is different from thinking.

This statement sounds strange as we normally believe that we are always thinking. We avoid intentionally following a train of thought during Zazen by concentrating on maintaining the posture. Of course spontaneous thoughts and images arise in our consciousness during Zazen, but they are not important.

When we notice that we are thinking about something, we should simply stop. If we correct our posture, the thought or perception will disappear and our consciousness will slowly become clear

and we will feel peaceful. In this peaceful and balanced state, we are in the state that is “different from thinking.”

However, if we intentionally try to attain the state that is different from thinking, we can never do so. When our consciousness is full of thoughts and feelings during Zazen, we should leave our state as it is. Our worries will bubble to the surface and evaporate into the universe! In this way, by concentrating on the posture, we will return naturally to our original state during our practice.

2. Making the Body Right—a Balanced Autonomic Nervous System

In Zazen we sit on a cushion on the floor with both legs crossed, and with our lower spine, upper spine, and head held straight vertically. Keeping the spine straight has a direct and immediate effect on the autonomic nervous system that controls many of our body's functions. Its effects include control of heart rate and force of contraction, constriction and dilatation of blood vessels, contraction and relaxation of smooth muscle in various organs, the ability to focus the eyes and the size of the pupils, and the secretion of hormones from various glands directly into the blood stream.

The autonomic nervous system is composed of two subsystems: the sympathetic and the parasympathetic nervous systems. When the sympathetic nervous system is stimulated, our heart rate increases, arteries and veins constrict, the lungs relax, and our pupils dilate; in short, we become tense and alert. When the parasympathetic nervous system is stimulated, the opposite happens; our heart rate decreases, arteries and veins dilate, the lungs contract, and the pupils constrict. You can see that the two systems prepare the body for an active or passive response—sometimes known as the “fight or flight” syndrome. When the effect of the two systems on the organs is in balance, we are neither ready to fight, nor ready to run away; we are in a normal state.

The parasympathetic nerves emerge from the spinal chord at the base of the spine (the second, third and fourth sacral vertebrae) and through the cranial vertebrae in the neck, whereas the sympathetic nerves emerge from the spinal chord through the middle vertebrae in the back (the T1 to L2 vertebrae). Keeping the spine normally upright, with the head sitting squarely on the top of the vertebral column minimizes the compression of the nerves of these two systems

at the points where the nerves emerge through the vertebrae, and ensures an uninterrupted supply of blood, allowing them to function normally. When the parasympathetic and sympathetic systems are both working normally, they function in opposition to give us a state of balance of body-and-mind; not too tense, and not too relaxed, not overly optimistic or pessimistic; not too aggressive and not too passive. It is this physical state of balance in the autonomic nervous system that give rise to what we call a balanced body-and-mind.

In addition to this, sitting in the upright posture, where the force of gravity acts down through the spine onto the pelvis, is a position in which our body's reflexes can work efficiently to integrate the functioning of the whole body.

3. Oneness of Body and Mind in the Present Moment

Usually we think there is something that is called "mind" and something else called "body" and that the two are separate, although they have a great effect on each other. In Buddhism we believe that body and mind are two sides of one entity, which we call "myself," but that we actually cannot fully grasp. We believe that every mental phenomenon has a physical side, and every physical phenomenon has a mental side. We do not believe in the independent existence of something called "mind" that is separate from the physical body, brain, nervous system, and so on. When we sit in Zazen, because we do not concentrate on thoughts, or perceptions, our body-and-mind exist undivided in the present moment. When our mind is in the ordinary state and our autonomic nervous system is balanced, we are in the "balanced state of body-and-mind."

4. Oneness with the Universe

When we are practicing Zazen, not only can we say that bodyand-mind are one; we are also sitting in the state where there is no distinction between ourselves and the external circumstances—the world around us. Most people have at some time experienced this simple feeling of oneness with everything, and in Zazen we can notice that it is not just a feeling, but the actual state of things in the present moment. When we are sitting in Zazen we are one with the Universe, and the state includes all

things and phenomena. In that sense, although we are experiencing the state, we cannot grasp it intellectually. We cannot describe it completely. We call the state “ineffable,” or “dharma,” or “truth,” or “reality.” But even these words are inadequate to describe the simple and original state that we return to in Zazen.
<http://terebess.hu/zen/mesterek/NishijimaZazen.pdf>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 17th, 2016 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: What is Luminosity?

Content:

fckw said:

can you tell which specific Tibetan or Sanskrit terms Malcolm referred to? A lot is lost during translation.

Malcolm wrote:

luminosity = 'od gsal ba

clarity = gsal ba.

Sometimes the latter is used as a abbreviation for the former.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 17th, 2016 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no record of a lot things.

gad rgyangs said:

if the mahayana sutras are actual records of teachings of the historical Buddha, there would be at least some mention of them in the Pali corpus, if no more than to reject them.

and even that makes no sense: the Buddha was obviously worshiped and idolized by his close circle. Do you seriously think they would have been at rajagriha but then were like "nah... thats not right, lets pretend he didn't give that teaching."?

Malcolm wrote:

Different people heard different things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 17th, 2016 at 3:17 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Saoshun said:

You don't understand process of Buddha, you do not have any cultivation achievements. Buddha was only 1 day in each village moving all the time, he set only process of purification, he was setting people life to way of enlightenment as set the sails, he was not cheating, he knew people limitations. Do you ever notice why they had orange-like robes? because is the color of basic root chakra, he was working on sutrayana first to get "soldiers" for the future. I do not know if you are trolling but I hope you are joking.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahahahaha, dude, there was no set color for monks robes. Some monks died their robes blue, etc. They just could not be white.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 17th, 2016 at 3:16 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

haha thats cheating.

Are you seriously saying that the monks who preserved and passed down the pali canon chose to exclude what later appeared as "mahayana" sutras because they didn't like them?

Malcolm wrote:

Why not? After all, there are millions of people who take a pass on Dzogchen and Vajrayāna (like Spiny Norman) because they don't like it or think that it is valid.

gad rgyangs said:

there are no records of councils or schisms from the early period where a "mahayana" sect split off and "their" sutras were rejected by the conservative elements.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no record of a lot things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 17th, 2016 at 2:56 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

haha thats cheating.

Are you seriously saying that the monks who preserved and passed down the pali canon chose to exclude what later appeared as "mahayana" sutras because they didn't like them?

Malcolm wrote:

Why not? After all, there are millions of people who take a pass on Dzogchen and Vajrayāna (like Spiny Norman) because they don't like it or think that it is valid.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 17th, 2016 at 2:40 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Arhats are nowhere described by the Buddha as having the ten powers, four fearlessnesses and so on. Ananda, in the Gopaka Moggallana Sutta, states that no one has all the qualities demonstrated by the Buddha.

gad rgyangs said:

so why don't they ask the Buddha: "tell us how to attain the same enlightenment that you have?"

Malcolm wrote:

They did. The answers are recorded in Mahāyāna sūtras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 17th, 2016 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.012.ntbb.html>, among others.

gad rgyangs said:

there he is describing his own state I see no comparison of it with arhatship.

Malcolm wrote:

Arhats are nowhere described by the Buddha as having the ten powers, four fearlessnesses and so on. Ananda, in the Gopaka Moggallana Sutta, states that no one has all the qualities demonstrated by the Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 17th, 2016 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He never equates the attainment of arhatship with total awakening.

Astus said:

Thus the requirement of a bodhisattva accumulating merit on a grand scale over aeons. But then it's been overwritten by the inherent buddha-nature whereby anyone can reach buddhahood in a single lifetime.

Malcolm wrote:

This latter statement of yours is false, the latter does not preclude the former.

Astus said:

And how can the full function of buddha-nature manifest? By not being attached to appearances, thus removing all obscurations. However, since arhats are also without clinging to appearances, their buddha-nature should manifest in the same way.

Malcolm wrote:

This statement lacks any basis. All obscurations are not removed merely through lacking attachment to appearances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 17th, 2016 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so is the Buddha portrayed in the Pali canon as saying "what I am teaching you here does not lead to total awakening: it is just a first step"?

Malcolm wrote:

He never equates the attainment of arhatship with total awakening.

gad rgyangs said:

how does he distinguish (in the Pali canon of course) his awakening from arhatship?

Malcolm wrote:

<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.012.ntbb.html>, among others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 17th, 2016 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: David Loy's call for ecological engagement

Content:

kirtu said:

<http://www.lionsroar.com/can-we-awaken-to-the-ecological-crisis/...> or as I would put it, Buddhists have to start helping to save the world.

Loy has a tendency to make claims from the unsubstantiated position that Buddhists are not already doing something but he has a point here even though most people I know have been engaged at least in raising consciousness about our looming ecological disasters.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Sour grapes on Loy's part. I don't know anyone who fits the description he is painting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 17th, 2016 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so is the Buddha portrayed in the Pali canon as saying "what I am teaching you here does not lead to total awakening: it is just a first step"?

Malcolm wrote:

He never equates the attainment of arhatship with total awakening.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 17th, 2016 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

One does not have to prove anything. One cannot attain buddhahood by following the path Buddha taught in the Pali canon because he did not teach that path in those teachings.

gad rgyangs said:

so you're saying a "Samma Sambuddha" is not a "Samma Sambuddha"?

Malcolm wrote:

I am saying that no path to becoming a sammāsambuddha is presented in teachings of the Samsambuddha in the Pali canon/Agamas, those teachings only exist in his Mahāyāna teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 16th, 2016 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so says the Mahayana mythology. The Theravada mythology begs to differ.

Malcolm wrote:

People somehow have developed this mistaken idea that because we can find examples of the pāramitās in the myths surrounding the careers of Buddhas in Theravāda texts that this makes Theravada teachings about the path of buddhahood equivalent with Mahāyāna teachings. They are not equivalent: not in structure, not in content and not as a path.

gad rgyangs said:

thats not the point. who says they're the same? the point is that some people prefer one mythology with its meditation advice, others prefer the other. It is only insecurity that would drive someone to consider it necessary to "prove" (as if that were possible) the superiority of one mythology over another.

Malcolm wrote:

One does not have to prove anything. One cannot attain buddhahood by following the path Buddha taught in the Pali canon because he did not teach that path in those teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 16th, 2016 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

so says the Mahayana mythology. The Theravada mythology begs to differ.

Malcolm wrote:

People somehow have developed this mistaken idea that because we can find examples of the pāramitās in the myths surrounding the careers of Buddhas in Theravāda texts that this makes Theravada teachings about the path of buddhahood equivalent with Mahāyāna teachings. They are not equivalent: not in structure, not in content and not as a path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 16th, 2016 at 11:32 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

]

Theres really no qualitative difference between arguing about which flavor of Buddhism is superior/inferior and being ISIS. Its only a quantitative difference: you use words, ISIS uses guns and bombs.

Malcolm wrote:

There is both a qualitative difference as well as the quantitative difference you mention. The qualitative difference is that no one is suggesting that Śrāvaka schools are peddling something false (that is the what Śrāvaka schools say about Mahāyāna), what is being suggested is that if you want to become a buddha instead of an arhat, you need to follow Mahāyāna because the path for achieving that does not exist in Śrāvakayāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 16th, 2016 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Caodemarte said:

Available for free reading in its entirety on Google books The Bodhisattva Ideal: Essays on the Emergence of Mahayana

By Karel Werner, Jeffrey Samuels, Bhikkhu Bodhi, Peter Skilling, Bhikkhu Anālayo, David McMahan is quite interesting in light of this thread. The bodhisattva ideal in Theravada is discussed. Good reading for anyone seriously interested in informed discussion on the differences between Theravada and the Mahayana as well as the rise of the early Mahayana.

Malcolm wrote:

All of the information in there is old news.

None of the articles seriously treat Nāgarjuna's and Maitreya's positions with respect to their rebuttal of Śrāvakayāna critics of Mahāyāna with regard to the the absence of a bodhisattva path in the Śrāvaka canon.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 16th, 2016 at 6:59 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Simon E. said:

It would be bad manners.

TRC said:

It is also bad manners to ascribe certain characteristics to a path that you do not personally practice. This has been mentioned before. How can one be completely objective about another path when it does not practice that path, but instead practices another path? Well of course it can't. So it is not only bad manners, but moreover, it is delusional.

Malcolm wrote:

Is there some kind of practice in Theravada which is absent in Mahāyāna? No, there is not. There is nothing in Theravada as path which is not also practiced in Mahāyāna, but there is much in Mahāyāna which is not practiced in Theravada, nor any other of the eighteen schools.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 16th, 2016 at 6:55 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

TRC said:

If the Mahayana was a higher more complete path it would have the knowledge and vision to understand that Theravada is not Hinayana.

Malcolm wrote:

But Theravada is indeed a Hināyāna path: that its goal is arhatship, it denies that bodhisattvas are awakened beings, etc. It bears all the characteristics Buddha tells us belong to a Hinayāna path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 16th, 2016 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Reggie Ray Mindrolling podcast

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Feeling unsafe and blown apart seems to be important concepts to Trungpa students, I have noticed. They generally like to brag about it.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, there may be some truth to what you say but your formulation is somewhat intemperate IMO.

Malcolm wrote:

Moderation was never my strong suite.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 16th, 2016 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The point actually is that if there is no Mahāyāna there could not be a Theravada or any other Hināyāna school because there would be no Buddha to teach śrāvakas the arhat path.

Adamantine said:

We are discussing people who have all mutually taken refuge in the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Sangha. Followers of Shakyamuni Buddha. So your seeming parallel is a non sequitur.

Astus said:

It would be possible to point out that Mahayana has a different interpretation of all three of the treasures, so while on the surface they sound the same, they don't mean the same, just like Buddha is the ninth incarnation of God for Vaisnavas. And even if they are the same, it still seems illogical to give any "benefit of doubt", as that would also mean doubting one's own tradition.

However Mahayana sutras are addressed to those embarking on the Bodhisattva path, they're not intended to make sravakas feel bad about themselves. As I already said, these types of things are contextual teaching devices, not proclamations to be heralded on billboards or in a Theravadan forum.

Vimalakirti sutra, ch 3 is a good example of making sravakas feel bad. But if such instances are teaching devices, then there is no discussion of any Hinayana school, only a number of misinterpretations that do not represent any actual doctrine and discipline, therefore it not only has nothing to do with Theravada, but it's not relevant to the Agama scriptures either. Personally, I am sympathetic to that interpretation of the Mahayana supremacist rhetoric, but so far it has not really surfaced in this thread as an option.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 16th, 2016 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

you and others have been taking of nothing but allegiances, that thats what the whole issue is: buying into a perspective

Malcolm wrote:

You and Herbie can team up in your Heman Belief Haters Club.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 16th, 2016 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: Reggie Ray Mindrolling podcast

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Well, on the mp3 at least, precisely at 31:47, although for context a little before would be good, maybe at 30:00 or so.

Malcolm wrote:

Feeling unsafe and blown apart seems to be important concepts to Trungpa students, I have noticed. They generally like to brag about it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 16th, 2016 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Reggie Ray Mindrolling podcast

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I listened to the interview last night and the bit about Ray not considering CTR to have been a Buddhist was a bit of a letdown.

Still, though, an interesting interview.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, where is it on the tape.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 16th, 2016 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Should the Open Dharma forum continue in its present form

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Perhaps you should start another, more responsible forum.

Malcolm wrote:

Already have.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 11:43 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Simon E. said:

I don't and wouldn't, pop up on Dhamma Wheel making claims of superiority or even equality...why would I ?

SpinyNorman said:

I'm not making "claims", just challenging the assumption that Theravada is inferior. And your phrase "even equality" speaks volumes.

Malcolm wrote:

However, it is foregone conclusion in Mahāyāna that Theravada, being part of the Śrāvakayāna, is a lower path. There is nothing even to argue about.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 11:32 PM

Title: Re: A good book on Jhanas

Content:

Bodhidharma said:

Hi, I came across Leigh Brasington's Right Concentration : A Practical Guide to the Jhanas. Very interesting ! It appears to be Theravada (excuse my limited experience with Buddhism). What is the Tibetan or Mahayana equivalent to such a book ? Is it samatha ? I tried looking it up on the net for a simple explanation but didn't get anything that enlightens (sorry I can't resist the pun), instead it got more confusing. Can someone throw some light on this ? Thanks...

Malcolm wrote:

One important thing you need to understand about all Theravada meditation traditions is that they were reconstituted from books in the mid 19th century in response to European interested in Buddhist meditation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism and Western Philosophy

Content:

smcj said:

You said "Rigpa was self-aware..." I was responding to that. Rigpa is not being aware of its own nature?

Malcolm wrote:

"Self-aware" is a term liable to misunderstanding. Generally it is taken to mean that a consciousness is aware of itself as an object.

Rigpa is not "self-aware" in that context.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

kirtu said:

That is completely ridiculous. Sartre was not a systematic, academic philosopher. After WW2 many philosophers weren't.

smcj said:

I'm still waiting on a clarification on this:

Sounds to me he was barking up the right tree. Too bad nobody ever told him that Rigpa was self-aware without any duality. It would have saved him a whole lot of work that was wasted believing the subject/object duality was unavoidable.

Malcolm wrote:

To be self-aware automatically implies duality...its an even worse duality, since consciousness needs to take itself as an object...

smcj said:

That was Sartre's thesis. My thesis is that Rigpa is non-dual awareness that does not take itself as an object, thus simply allowing it to express itself to itself. (Easier said than done.) Somehow you seem to be agreeing with Sartre and not me, while having just dissed Sartre.

If this thread goes further it might be good to end up in the Lounge.

Malcolm wrote:

You said "Rigpa was self-aware..." I was responding to that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 10:46 PM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sartre is not a serious philosopher.

kirtu said:

That is completely ridiculous. Sartre was not a systematic, academic philosopher. After WW2 many philosophers weren't.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and they are not serious either. FWIW, I was raised by a philosophy professor.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 10:40 PM

Title: Re: Should the Open Dharma forum continue in its present form

Content:

rory said:

Now whether you regard Open Dharma as a Hell realm like Malcolm and Simon...

Malcolm wrote:
I view it as irresponsible.

Ayu said:
Harsh words from someone, who demanded "Free speech" at another occasion on DW.

So what is your proposal? Please define it.

Malcolm wrote:
There are limits to free speech, there always have been.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 10:31 PM
Title: Re: Should the Open Dharma forum continue in its present form
Content:
rory said:
Now whether you regard Open Dharma as a Hell realm like Malcolm and Simon...

Malcolm wrote:
I view it as irresponsible.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 10:23 PM
Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?
Content:
Adamantine said:
Well, inferior doesn't sound nice - but deconstructing this with all honesty--
If one path is complete, and one is incomplete, wouldn't you say the complete one was the superior one? (I mean, you know, if you had a gun to your head)

SpinyNorman said:
But then a Theravadan probably wouldn't accept the premise that the Theravada path is incomplete. So again we're back to the problem of subjectivity, one vehicle judging another according to its own assumptions, and not to any objective standard.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, Theravadins would not accept their path is incomplete, but the ultimate of the lower is the relative of the higher, and from a Mahāyāna point of view the Theravada path, along with the path of the rest of the eighteen schools, is incomplete in that following it will not result in buddhahood.

In other words, for a Mahāyāni, the point of the path is not only personal freedom, but rather it is the attainment of bodhisattva awakening and eventual buddhahood in order to free all sentient beings from suffering. The path laid out in the 18 schools simply does

not cover the bodhisattva path.

The Buddha teaches in many sūtras that the arhat path is incomplete and inferior. So, really, it is not Mahāyānis who are making this statement, it is the Buddha.

You may choose not read those sūtras the Buddha taught where he expresses these things, that is your privilege. But in a Mahāyāna forum, one assumes that the Buddha's teaching in Mahāyāna sūtras are the baseline for what is higher and lower, and so on, and in this case, the Buddha in these sūtras clearly lays out which paths lead to which results. Moreover, there is an entire literature explicating in detail the meaning of these issues, authored by Nāgārjuna, Maitreyanatha and their followers, who clearly explain the intent of the Buddha in the Mahāyāna Sūtras. Those are the teachers we follow, and it is their teachings on this matter to which we refer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

smcj said:

If I'm not mistaken they do call Sakyamuni in his previous lives a Bodhisattva. That's say he was on a different path.

SpinyNorman said:

As far as I can see a Buddha is a Buddha. It's not like there are "inferior and selfish" Buddhas.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure there are, pratyekabuddhas are lower than samyaksambuddhas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dhyāna is very precisely defined. It is not at all mysterious to those who have been properly educated and trained in Buddhadharma.

jundo cohen said:

Hi Malcolm,

You remain a master of the cut and dried assertion, I feel anyway.

In such case, "properly trained" may come down to being the fellow and his interpretation that the speaker happens to believe.

A fascinating book of a few years ago was Richard Shankman's "The Experience of Samadhi", not particularly for the author's personal interpretation, but for the interviews with many experienced and venerated teachers from a variety of lineages (granted, primarily on the Theravada/Vipassana side of things), who agreed on very little in the details.

<http://www.shambhala.com/the-experience-of-samadhi.html>

Malcolm wrote:

Considering that Theravadins completely reconstituted their meditation traditions from books, it is not surprising at all that there are disagreement among them.

Fortunately, in the Tibetan tradition we have a continuous meditation tradition which goes back to Indian Buddhism and its continuities. While there are indeed disagreements over some philosophical issues, there is broad agreement, experientially as well as theoretically, over such issues was what constitutes the first dhyāna and so forth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Hi Astus,

Yes, it could be so ... assuming, of course, that the "various manuals" and tests are reliable. How often have we seen voices, visions, various unusual phenomena, miracles and the like proclaimed and confirmed by "experts" in all religions only to have a more worldly cause demonstrated later? One might call this "Shroud of Turin" Syndrome.

Malcolm wrote:

For example?

jundo cohen said:

As in our recent discussion of "Jhanas", there has been some wonderful writing in recent years which basically shows how poorly the meaning is defined, how little agreement on what the experience constitutes, great subjectivity and disagreement in how to test for it and so forth.

Malcolm wrote:

Dhyāna is very precisely defined. It is not at all mysterious to those who have been properly educated and trained in Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Should the Open Dharma forum continue in its present form

Content:

Simon E. said:

It's an extraordinary moment...On a forum dedicated to Mahayana and Vajrayana we are told that seeing Buddhadharma in terms of the Mahayana and Vajrayana 'stinks of sectarianism'

As though the forum were a platform for the neutral discussion of academia...which apparently for a tiny few it is.

Which perhaps follows naturally if you don't actually practise Mahayana or Vajrayana Buddhadharma.

Malcolm wrote:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=21709&start=120#p320132>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: Dudjom Tersar question

Content:

Adamantine said:

Dorje Drollo is within the Guru cycle, but it is not generally given or permitted until one is quite advanced on the path. It is perhaps the most secretive and protected practice within this terma.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahahaha, this was the very first empowerment I ever received in Nyingma...other than the Khon Kllaya....

Adamantine said:

I'm guessing not the Dudjom-- was it Kunzang Dechen Lingpa's Drollo terma you're referring to? I think I was at the same wang with you in Vermont.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am referring to the full Dudjom Drollo empowerment granted by Ngagpa Yeshe Dorje in 1992 in Newton, Ma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 2:12 AM

Title: Re: Should the Open Dharma forum continue in its present form

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In this subforum, there is neither Dharma of realization nor Dharma of texts. The minute you introduce texts, then people like Kim issue derisive statements to the effect that one cannot here use textual authority. This is completely wrong headed.

Adamantine said:

Really? Is that true? I haven't followed so many threads in Open Dharma, so I haven't witnessed this.

Malcolm wrote:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=66&t=21709&start=20#p319608>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Should the Open Dharma forum continue in its present form

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Disrespect is one thing, but I really think there should be a place on DW for people to ask detailed and CHALLENGING questions about Mahayana. There is no need to defend anything. Factual or logical errors are easily corrected. Everything else is basically down to one's faith or trust or whatever, and that is all one really needs to say to defend it. Some people may not like that, but isn't that how it really is?

Malcolm wrote:

There are already many places for this on DW, the whole forum in fact.

dzogchungpa said:

Nope, the whole reason this thread exists is because I pointed out to you that saying you preferred the Mahayana POV was irrelevant in the Open Dharma forum, i.e. that it was not a good argument here. Apparently that was too challenging but I don't think it should be disallowed on that account, or even discouraged.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that the "Open Dharma" forum is a misnomer, there is no such thing as "open dharma," as if it were code.

Dharma is not based on the petty squabbles of the ignorant and the fraudulent, it is based on the realization of the Buddhas. Those who do not themselves possess realization, must depend on the Dharma of texts. In this subforum, there is neither Dharma of realization nor Dharma of texts. The minute you introduce texts, then people like Kim issue derisive statements to the effect that one cannot here use textual

authority. This is completely wrong headed.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 1:01 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Another area which I believe is related to "How much should Buddhism Change" is the question "How much can Buddhism do without superstition?" That is certainly eye of the beholder, depending on such basic questions as what one considers "superstition". I personally advocate Buddhism abandoning much within it that is perhaps superstition and fallacy.

Astus said:

I consider that too extreme a view. It is undeniable that not only rebirth but also superpowers have always been very much elements of Buddhism. Seeing them as metaphors and superstitions is failing to understand what they meant to our ancestors and even to many contemporary practitioners. Instead of rejecting them out of cultural habit, there are two important areas where we can practise openness towards initially strange teachings. One is the anthropological and historical approach, considering the role of those teachings in the past. Second is the practical approach, in how we can actually make use of those elements of the path. I think both are possible, interesting and educational.

Malcolm wrote:

There are people who care about the Dharma, and then there are people who care about wearing funny gear, having students and followers, and otherwise putting on spiritual pretenses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

One difference now is that we have some actual tools to know how the world likely is structured and how it works, just a tad better than in the past.

Malcolm wrote:

Having abandoned inner tools and inner knowledge, which are infinitely precise, we have instead come to depend on material tools that are crude and limited, which crudely limit how much of the world we can actually see.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

I personally advocate Buddhism abandoning much within it that is superstition and fallacy.

Malcolm wrote:

You are just editing Buddhadharma to fit with your conceptuality.

jundo cohen said:

As has everyone in the Mahayana since the founders invented the Mahayana and its sacred books out of whole cloth to fit their own conceptuality of what Buddhadharma should be, and as inspired and creative teachers have done ever since.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyāna was not invented out of whole cloth, and the suggestion that is such a fabrication is deeply offensive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 12:41 AM

Title: Re: Should the Open Dharma forum continue in its present form

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Disrespect is one thing, but I really think there should be a place on DW for people to ask detailed and CHALLENGING questions about Mahayana. There is no need to defend anything. Factual or logical errors are easily corrected. Everything else is basically down to one's faith or trust or whatever, and that is all one really needs to say to defend it. Some people may not like that, but isn't that how it really is?

Malcolm wrote:

There are already many places for this on DW, the whole forum in fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

I personally advocate Buddhism abandoning much within it that is superstition and fallacy.

Malcolm wrote:

You are just editing Buddhadharma to fit with your conceptuality.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 15th, 2016 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

May I ask how you know who is a qualified teacher?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it starts with one's prospective teacher having received a good education in Dharma, etc.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, how do you know what constitutes a good education in Dharma, or even what Dharma is, etc?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, it is pretty easy to ascertain — Sakya Pandita opined that it took about 7 years to become competent in Dharma studies.

As for what Dharma is? That is similarly easy, whatever is conducive to liberation is Dharma, the opposite is not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 14th, 2016 at 9:53 PM

Title: Re: Dudjom Tersar question

Content:

Adamantine said:

Dorje Drollo is within the Guru cycle, but it is not generally given or permitted until one is quite advanced on the path. It is perhaps the most secretive and protected practice within this terma.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahahaha, this was the very first empowerment I ever received in Nyingma...other than the Khon Kllaya....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 14th, 2016 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Dudjom Tersar question

Content:

madhusudan said:

I feel really fortunate to have connected to this authentic lineage. The wording of the ngondro is profound in the way that it condenses vast teachings into just a few words. I wonder about the statement that it is, "intended for those who do not understand or are unable to recite the extensive preliminary practices according to the New Treasure."

I'm wondering, is this a complete path? Or should one aspire to the "extensive preliminaries"? I guess I'm asking because I feel really suited to the concise presentation of the dharma in this terma and I want to commit to just one simple essence path. Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dudjom Tersar ngondro is a complete path. The extensive ngondro states explicitly states that one needs no other practice besides it.

In Dudjom's Rinpoche collected works, in the volume that contains the extensive ngondro and its commentary, the two main practice manuals for practicing Dzogchen are found directly after it. If you follow this system, you don't really need any other practices at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 14th, 2016 at 9:38 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

seeker242 said:

What other people do or don't do is their own business. What they do or don't do is irrelevant. I think you've missed the point I was making, which is that it's not appropriate to engage in offensive speech....If you are trying to say that just being a Mahayana Buddhist, is itself, offensive, that is not close to being the same as oneself engaging in offensive speech.

Malcolm wrote:

So, by using the term "Hināyāna," Buddha was engaged in offensive speech?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 14th, 2016 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

May I ask how you know who is a qualified teacher?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, it starts with one's prospective teacher having received a good education in Dharma, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 14th, 2016 at 6:02 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

ok I'll bite: for example?

Malcolm wrote:

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, for example, is a bodhisattva on the stages.

gad rgyangs said:

actually, if you read the description of the first stage here:

<http://www.lotsawahouse.org/tibetan-masters/patrul-rinpoche/stages-and-path>

it actually does sound like him.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed...hence my point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 14th, 2016 at 4:41 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Simon E. said:

This isn't about me..or you. No matter how much cuts that across your attention seeking agenda.

dzogchungpa said:

Yeah, I really should get a life, shouldn't I?

Simon E. said:

Its about the fact that real teachers exist with real teachings for those who can get their eyes off their own reflection.

dzogchungpa said:

You mean, like Ngakpa Chogyam and Pema Khandro?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 14th, 2016 at 4:35 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Saoshun said:

We can talk about it. I actually have good understanding (read almost all english publication of dzogchen) on the concept based and view, and rigpa etc. but sitting all the time in rigpa doesn't seem to release from samsara beyond recognition of rigpa which is there, but maybe I miss some other instructions to get with union empty and blissful as they say.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahahaha, my friend, reading about Dzogchen will get you no where.

And no, we cannot really talk about. Dzogchen is the path that depends on direct introduction and personal experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 14th, 2016 at 4:04 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, for example, is a bodhisattva on the stages.

Saoshun said:

he seems rather like intellectual dzogchen wh just passing the view and talks about it. but I do not know him rather besides some youtube videos and couple ifnformation that he passing things like yantra yoga etc. but I do not see any manufactured enlightenment beings by his works. Many of his students which I met have rather level of realization like lip service dzogchen, it's fine while talking about it but then when life gets you it's useless.

Malcolm wrote:

You don't understand Dzogchen. If you did, you would not say such silly things.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 14th, 2016 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

ok I'll bite: for example?

Malcolm wrote:

Chogyal Namkhai Norbu, for example, is a bodhisattva on the stages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 14th, 2016 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Should the Open Dharma forum continue in its present form

Content:

smcj said:

Let's make Dzogchungpa the moderator and add the rule that you've got to have a sense of humor to post in Open Dharma. That should diffuse problematic posting.

dzogchungpa said:

This.

Simon E. said:

Yes. The way that putting the village idiot in charge of the coffers would solve the communities finance problems.

dzogchungpa said:

I'm beginning to feel like a bit of an Aunt Sally.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 14th, 2016 at 3:37 AM

Title: Re: What is terma?

Content:

Terma said:

Someone here please correct me if this is wrong, but I have been taught that all Tertons are emanations of one of the "25 disciples of Guru Rinpoche" that were present during the assembly of the great dispensation. This is the direct correlation of why these particular Masters were destined to find the particular Terma at that specific time.

Malcolm wrote:

This really is not true. There are all kinds of termas that have nothing to do with Padmasambhava, for example, the 17 tantras, Vima Nyingthig, the Brahmin cycle, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 14th, 2016 at 3:35 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Have you met and interviewed Arhats, Bodhisattvas and Buddhas in order to understand what if any realization they have, or are you merely reporting what is said in various old texts of diverse origins? And on what grounds do you decide which of those texts, when they disagree, you will believe?

Reporting on, and discussing what is presented in old texts is called historical research, and is very interesting. Taking what they say as absolutely veridical without a shred of evidence is foolhardy.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, we have that evidence in the form of the continued tradition of practice of Mahāyāna teachings for more than 2000 years.

We also have the evidence of the practice of Theravada, etc., for 2000 years.

We know quite well that for Theravadins, etc., nirvana is the end of the road, cessation. This point of view is strictly rejected in Mahāyāna.

gad rgyangs said:

we know what the texts say, that's not the issue. The question is, do the texts make any sense & what is the concrete evidence that anything in them is true? Isn't there an irredeemable subjective component to the whole thing, in that there is no way to proceed from the assumption of another's attainment?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha describes quite well in the Agamas the differences between his realization and that of four classes of aryas.

gad rgyangs said:

And as far as the different fruits go, well let's talk to an Arhat, a Bodhisattva on the levels and a Samyak Sambuddha and ask them. Oh wait.... there aren't any to talk to..

Malcolm wrote:

Umm, that is really not true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 14th, 2016 at 1:13 AM

Title: Re: Should the Open Dharma forum continue in its present form

Content:

Jeff H said:

Challenging Buddha's teachings in order to re-establish them for ourselves is a common Buddhist teaching across many traditions.

Malcolm wrote:

People are challenging the teachings without even beginning to understand them, or as in the case of some here, have no interest really in learning what Mahāyāna Buddhism actually is and why it critiques non-Mahāyāna schools.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 14th, 2016 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

Matt J said:

One could argue that those who reject rebirth aren't Buddhists, but neo-Buddhists. Why? Because they reject the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Noble Truth. Under the materialist view, the origin of suffering is biological birth, and suffering will cease upon death. Accordingly, the Buddhist teachings are at best, merely an early exit from suffering. At worst, they are a complete waste of time.

Rather than spend time on practice, we would be better off spending our time earning money or otherwise making ourselves as comfortable as possible until the liberating moment of death. The quickest and surest path to the end of suffering is not Zen, Vajrayana, Dzogchen, or Mahamudra, but actually a premature death.

It seems like the whole enterprise falls apart without rebirth.

Kim O'Hara said:

Uh, uh ... suffering will cease upon death, you say, but how do you know?
And what happens if you're wrong?

At times like this, I call for the Apannaka Sutta:

<http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/mn/mn.060.than.html>

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

Thus — by means of the divine eye, purified and surpassing the human — he sees beings passing away and re-appearing, and he discerns how they are inferior and superior, beautiful and ugly, fortunate and unfortunate in accordance with their kamma. And thus, we can see here clearly the Buddha taught rebirth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 14th, 2016 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: Should the Open Dharma forum continue in its present form

Content:
Ayu said:
Criticized? Can you give examples, please?

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, the Abhisamaya-alaṃkāra contains a detailed critique of the arhat path and pratyekabuddha path based on the Prajñāpāramitā sūtras.

The first section of the Mahāyāna Sūtrālaṃkāra similarly contains a fairly detailed critique of Hināyāna schools and a defense of Mahāyāna.

These are just the treatises involved. In the sūtras themselves the Buddha mentions many reasons why the path taught in the Agamas/Nikayas is incomplete and not the definitive meaning.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, January 13th, 2016 at 11:45 PM
Title: Re: Should the Open Dharma forum continue in its present form
Content:
Norwegian said:
I find it extremely tiresome that actual quotes from Mahayana sutras can be questioned, challenged, ridiculed, picked apart, and criticized on a Mahayana and Vajrayana Buddhism forum. Of all the places.

dzogchungpa said:
Do you think everything in every Mahayana sutra is literally true?

Malcolm wrote:
That is completely beside the point. But do you think that everything written about Buddhadharma in Western Academia is literally true? Do you think the account of the rise of Mahāyāna given by Western Academics is more true than the account traditionally given? Are people even aware of what the traditional account is?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, January 13th, 2016 at 11:37 PM
Title: Re: Should the Open Dharma forum continue in its present form
Content:

kirtu said:
We should also be able to defend the orthodox Mahayana position on its own merits.

Malcolm wrote:
No, that is not allowed in this forum. In other words, in a Mahāyāna forum there is a subforum where people are barred from using that tradition's own texts as a means to

defend the tradition when it is attacked:

Kim O'Hara said:

If you can point us towards some standards by which to judge the superiority or inferiority of a religious path - from outside that religion - I would be delighted. But if you can only argue Mahayana's superiority from within Mahayana, your arguments are fatally tainted by the stink of self-justification.

kirtu said:

Debating the teachings is also meritorious.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if there is a common basis for debate.

Actually, Mahāyāna texts do identify very specific Hināyāna positions that Theravadins continue to hold, and refute them precisely on the basis of what those Agama/Nikāya sūtras do or don't teach. In order to show how Mahāyāna is superior to Hinayāna it is precisely by relying on those texts that we do so, as Nāgārjuna indicates in the Ratnavali.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 13th, 2016 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: Should the Open Dharma forum continue in its present form

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, unless I'm mistaken, DW is a forum where everyone, even non-Buddhists, can discuss Mahayana and Vajrayana. I think it's a sign of strength that the whole place doesn't have to be some kind of Mahayana safe space.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not mean we have to provide a sandbox for people to engage in non-virtue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 13th, 2016 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Should the Open Dharma forum continue in its present form

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Why would we, as a Mahāyāna forum, wish to encourage a subforum where people can engage in the unmeritorious activity of criticizing Mahāyāna Dharma?

Astus said:

People have questions whether they can post it or not. They also have disagreements to various degrees. Since the sections for specific traditions are meant to accept and maintain the given school's tenets - that is, as I imagine it, in a discussion those are the sources that take primacy over other. Therefore, Open Dharma means that no source whatsoever have primacy. Although in a way that is a straight way to chaos and

confusion, it could also mean a 'pure reason' arena, where only the very basics of perception and logic counts. Except that very few, if any, can uphold such argument rules. Still, we can try.

Malcolm wrote:

Why should Mahāyānis have to defend Mahāyāna on a Mahāyāna forum?

Why should there be a subforum where people are allowed to challenge any and all Mahāyāna tenets with impunity?

There is plenty of debate in the specific traditions forums, debate that is open and grounded in sources.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 13th, 2016 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

Have you met and interviewed Arhats, Bodhisattvas and Buddhas in order to understand what if any realization they have, or are you merely reporting what is said in various old texts of diverse origins? And on what grounds do you decide which of those texts, when they disagree, you will believe?

Reporting on, and discussing what is presented in old texts is called historical research, and is very interesting. Taking what they say as absolutely veridical without a shred of evidence is foolhardy.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, we have that evidence in the form of the continued tradition of practice of Mahāyāna teachings for more than 2000 years.

We also have the evidence of the practice of Theravada, etc., for 2000 years.

We know quite well that for Theravadins, etc., nirvana is the end of the road, cessation. This point of view is strictly rejected in Mahāyāna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 13th, 2016 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Should the Open Dharma forum continue in its present form?

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

1. There is no need whatsoever for any member to view Open Dharma unless they actively choose to do so, and even less need for them to participate in it.

Malcolm wrote:

I have explained to you before that avoiding forums is not the way to go.

Kim O'Hara said:

2. That said, it is apparent from the stats on the Index page that a large number of members do value the forum.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it merely draws a high number of views because it is the forum in which there are the most controversies.

Kim O'Hara said:

3. The admin team did review both the existence and the guidelines for the forum quite recently and made them clearer but didn't change them in any substantive way.

Malcolm wrote:

As I pointed out, the language you chose ENCOURAGES CRITICISM OF THE DHARMA.

Kim O'Hara said:

4. One primary reason for retaining Open Dharma was precisely for discussing differences between schools - and not just Mahayana vis-a-vis Theravada, but Vajrayana vis-a-vis Pure Land, or Zen vis-a-vis Sufism, etc. For that discussion to be free, the guideline needed to be, as it is now, "... all Mahayana teachings are open to challenge." But that is quarantined from the rest of the board by the first half of that sentence, "The only forum on Dharma Wheel in which ..." (emphasis added).

Malcolm wrote:

Only a non-Mahāyāni would have written the rules of this subforum in this way. Why would we, as a Mahāyāna forum, wish to encourage a subforum where people can engage in the unmeritorious activity of criticizing Mahāyāna Dharma?

Kim O'Hara said:

5. Return to point (1) if (4) still bothers you.

Malcolm wrote:

This not the same as for example, avoiding going to white power forums, etc. Here, you are permitting a level of prejudice and polemics that is not tolerated on Dhamma Wheel.

In short, the principles of this "open dharma" subforum are neither open nor Dharmic. It is an embarrassment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 13th, 2016 at 7:43 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

tomamundsen said:
Is this unreasonable?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is quite unreasonable to have a subforum in a Buddhist forum in which it is allowed for people to attack the very foundations of Buddhadharma, and secondly, in a Mahāyāna forum, to attack the foundation of Mahāyāna.

For example, Kim would like there to be some standard outside of Mahāyāna for Mahāyāna critiques of arhat path and so on. When evidence is provided from Mahāyāna Sūtras and treatises, it is dismissed as invalid. But this is quite ironic — here, in a Mahāyāna forum, evidence from Mahāyāna sūtras themselves are not counted as sufficient evidence for the Mahāyāna position. Amazing and disgusting.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 13th, 2016 at 6:39 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Please feel free to do so. All I am saying is that in the Open Dharma forum, saying you prefer the Mahayana POV is not much of an argument. Perhaps you object to the mere existence of such a subforum in a Mahayana forum, but that is a separate issue. As far as I can tell, the whole point of the Open Dharma forum is that it is open to other, possibly non-Mahayana, POVs, right?

Malcolm wrote:

I have objected to this forum often to the staff.

The fact that this is a Mahāyāna forum means that Mahāyāna standards should dominate. Having Open Dharma forum here is akin to a Black Lives Matter forum having a special area for the KKK.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 13th, 2016 at 6:35 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

A) do some Buddhist texts represent the Buddha saying that Mahayana is superior to Hinayana? Yes.

B) did the historical Buddha ever say any such thing? No way of knowing, but doubtful.

C) are such sayings more likely nothing but triumphalist sectarian boasting issuing from much later Buddhist communities and put into the mouth of the Buddha as an attempt at legitimization? Almost certainly.

Malcolm wrote:

This assumes that you have decided there is no difference between the realization of an arhat, for example, and a Buddha. It also means that you have excluded the possibility of awakened bodhisattvas, ala Theravada.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 13th, 2016 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

... I prefer the traditional account of the rise of Mahāyāna. Given that this is a Mahāyāna forum, it is one that should receive the most respect.

dzogchungpa said:

OK, but as I tried to point out earlier, apparently in a way that displeased some mod, this is the Open Dharma forum i.e. the "only forum on Dharma Wheel in which all Mahayana teachings are open to challenge" so your point here is irrelevant.

Malcolm wrote:

Can you imagine the shit storm that would ensue if I took your attitude to Dhammawheel? As far as I know, Mahāyanīs do not pester Theravadins with the Mahāyāna POV there. Why should anti-Mahāyāna sentiments be left unchallenged here?

If this is the Open Dharma forum, than this means that it is entirely appropriate for me to post any and all sūtras where Buddha discusses the difference between Hinayāna and Mahāyāna (there are many), as well as any commentaries which are germane to the point.

Further, this agenda of this forum is unfair. The Dhamma Wheel Open Dhamma Forum simple states, "An open and inclusive investigation into Buddhism and spiritual cultivation."

Why should we experience the discrimination of having "The only forum on Dharma Wheel in which all Mahayana teachings are open to challenge. Discuss 'hot topics' such as rebirth, karma and differences between schools..."?

It is simply wrong.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 13th, 2016 at 6:17 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Simon E. said:

There is no contradiction here. To establish the nature of the Great Vehicle it is not

necessary to delineate other vehicles.

Malcolm wrote:

But they are delineated, as the Sūtra of Great Liberation states:

The Hinayāna is explained to narrow-minded śrāvakas. The Madhyayāna is explained to the broader-minded pratyekabuddhas. The Mahāyāna is explained to the bodhisattva mahāsattvas who have entered the great path.

And:

The example for the Mahāyāna is Sumeru,

the example for Hinayāna is an anthill.

The example for Mahāyāna is the sun and moon,

the example for Hinayāna is a spark.

Kim O'Hara said:

Sigh.

Standard sectarian polemics.

Malcolm wrote:

No, these are the words of the Buddha.

Kim O'Hara said:

Not even a trace of justification for them - or perhaps there is but you just didn't bother posting the continuation?

Malcolm wrote:

Why do I need to justify the words of the Buddha? Are you going to censor the Buddha's own words now as sectarian polemics?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 13th, 2016 at 6:05 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

That's a savagely truncated version of a long and interesting paper. The whole of it is worth reading.

Malcolm wrote:

It assumes that the Western Academic version of Buddhist history is the correct one.

Kim O'Hara said:

Do you have a better version, then?

Malcolm wrote:

It is a just so story, just like any history.

That being the case, I prefer the traditional account of the rise of Mahāyāna. Given that

this is a Mahāyāna forum, it is one that should receive the most respect.

That being the case, I therefore assume that Mahāyāna was taught during the Buddha's career, irrespective of when Mahāyāna sūtras were set down in writing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 13th, 2016 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Hmmm.. would

appearances be equivalent with the dependent nature
conventions equivalent with illusory nature

In the Yogacara view?

Bakmoon said:

I also would really like to know the answer to this question. The Yogacara teaching of the three natures has always been a bit confusing to me because different sources seem to present them differently (and that's just in a Cittamatra context, not even going into the Shentong version of the three natures).

Mostly I am confused because some sources make it sound like the dependent nature means the appearance of the object and the illusory nature is the designation applied to it, but in other places it sounds like the dependent nature refers to the mind, and the illusory nature is the appearance.

Also, is the idea of mapping the three natures onto the two truths with the illusory nature and dependent nature being subdivisions of conventional truth something that is laid out in Indian texts or is that a latter appropriation?

Malcolm wrote:

Conventions are the imputed nature. Appearances are the imputed nature in the dependent nature.

The mapping of the two truths to the three natures is a Tibetan thing.

There is no mention at all of the the two truths in the three of the five treatises of Maitreya. The two truths are mentioned briefly in the Uttaratantra and once in the Sutra-alamkara. Any discussions about relative and ultimate truth are generally confined to Vasubandhu's Yogacara commentaries, etc., apart from Asanga briefly discussing them in his Uttaratantra commentary.

Basically, it appears that Yogacarins tried to come up with an explanation of emptiness

that completely bypasses the idea of the two truths.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 13th, 2016 at 3:50 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

Matt J said:

This is not an easy question to answer. Take this cup. Lots of appearances--- table, floor, cold feeling, tingling etc., but I select some of them and say "cup." So I can't say the appearance doesn't depend on the convention. On the other hand, if I close my eyes, the cup appearance vanishes, so I can't say that the appearance does depend on the convention.

Even worse, whatever one would call a convention is also an appearance--- a thought or set of thoughts, feelings, etc.

I would reject them both and say interdependent.

Malcolm wrote:

It is pretty clear that conventions depend on appearances. In other words, there has to first be an appearance upon which a convention is settled.

Relative truths are appearances to a misapprehending mind, while conventions are designations made on the basis of appearances.

Thus, when it is said that something exists conventionally, this means no more and no less than a group of people have agreed that a given appearance bears the identity which has been agreed upon. Thus appearances do not depend on conventions, but conventions certainly depend on appearances. As such, they are a step removed from perception. Appearances are perceived, conventions are not, the latter are superimposed on appearances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 13th, 2016 at 2:55 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

Matt J said:

I would say there is no convention apart from appearances, so what's with separating them?

Malcolm wrote:

Which is dependent on the other?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, January 13th, 2016 at 2:30 AM
Title: Re: Emptiness
Content:
Matt J said:
I vote for: appearances!

Malcolm wrote:
What precisely is a convention?
Let me ask you then. Does the convention arise before the appearance, with the appearance or after the appearance?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, January 13th, 2016 at 12:40 AM
Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?
Content:
Ayu said:
I mean: whatever path one chooses, one should study that, understand it more and more, stick to it - and don't compare it.

SpinyNorman said:
I agree, but it's not me who is comparing one set of schools unfavourably to another set with an inbuilt assumption of superiority.

Malcolm wrote:
Mahāyāna has that inbuilt assumption, hence its name: "Mahāyāna."

Author: Malcolm
Date: Wednesday, January 13th, 2016 at 12:36 AM
Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?
Content:
Simon E. said:
There is no contradiction here. To establish the nature of the Great Vehicle it is not necessary to delineate other vehicles.

Malcolm wrote:
But they are delineated, as the Sūtra of Great Liberation states:
The Hinayāna is explained to narrow-minded śrāvakas. The Madhyayāna is explained to the broader-minded pratyekabuddhas. The Mahāyāna is explained to the bodhisattva mahāsattvas who have entered the great path.
And:
The example for the Mahāyāna is Sumeru,
the example for Hināyāna is an anthill.

The example for Mahāyāna is the sun and moon,
the example for Hinayāna is a spark.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 11:26 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What precisely is a convention?

Taco_Rice said:

Obviously, it's the way things appear to ordinary people in ordinary daily existence.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean things appear to us as or through social contracts? No, I don't think so.

Taco_Rice said:

He's obviously using this word to signify what is referred to in T'ien T'ai stuff as "provisional positing," where the world is full of birds, trees, cars, cities, theme parks and data collators, whereas in Emptiness there is ultimately no car, no tires to go missing, no witnesses or authorities to report to nor any bat to strike any head nor trauma to overcome. Thusness; all that is is what everything is, whereas you thought it was what you thought—despite the fact that it is precisely because it isn't, which is why you thought that. That truth is everywhere, just like that bat.

Malcolm wrote:

So now you have three isolates to deal with provisional positing, emptiness and suchness.

One: are these three things the or different?

Two: Are emptiness and suchness not the same thing?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Consuming Honey = Stealing?

Content:

lucidaromulus said:

Is consuming honey considered supporting the act of committing Stealing?

Reason being, them bees spend their day gathering honey, whiles the bee guy/girl collects the honey without asking permission and seeking consent.

Malcolm wrote:

The bees are actually paying rent on nice condos built for them by beekeepers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

gad rgyangs said:

a Tibetan Lama told me in private once that people of lower intelligence as far as dharma goes are born in Hinayana countries, and those with higher capacity are born in Mahayana countries and of course those with the greatest intelligence and capacity are born in Vajrayana Tibet.

Conversely, a monk at a Burmese temple, after I told him I was a student of Tibetan Buddhism, invited me to come to his temple to "learn the real Buddhism".

what a bunch of wankers.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they have not understood that the people with the very most highest capacity are classical guitarists in NYC.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 10:17 PM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

"Enlightenment" (at least as we encounter and live such in the Zen corner of the Mahayana, others may define "enlightenment" some other way) can be encountered, embodied, expressed and lived.

Malcolm wrote:

In other words, it is just a belief that you hold, and ill-defined at that.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

rachmiel said:

Malcolm,

Again, conventionally, but not inherently.

Is Malcolm real?

Well, yes, conventionally it's the most real thing you know, your moment to moment qualia.

But ultimately, no, it is a conceptual construct that tries to "freeze" your ever-changing mindstream into a fixed independent entity.

Malcolm wrote:

What precisely is a convention?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

That's a savagely truncated version of a long and interesting paper. The whole of it is worth reading.

Malcolm wrote:

It assumes that the Western Academic version of Buddhist history is the correct one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 5:35 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

Matt J said:

It seems like the whole enterprise falls apart without rebirth.

Malcolm wrote:

It does, but then what to do with the fancy gear, robes, titles and students?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 5:18 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Jundo:

You resort to the same fallacy twice in the course of a single day. Your wits need some

sharpening.

You are so hilarious -- you accept "Enlightenment" with about the same evidence for it as there is for the FSM, and yet you reject rebirth since there is no evidence for it.

Well, what did someone say once? "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds..."

jundo cohen said:

And Malcolm, Also there are a huge number of assumptions in the above, themselves liable to be faulted.

Oh yes. Arguments against rebirth are "assumptions" while those in favor (no matter how "what if" and jumping through hoops to explain) are evidence ...

... and we should just believe. If I may offer (and I just propose the possibility, I could be wrong), the method of argumentation you employ is about the same as people in another corner of the religious world use to defend the earth being 5000 years old and made in 6 Days. The difference? Perhaps only that they are religious Christians defending a hard to swallow tenet of their religion via similar routes of defense. I must say about them as well, that "anything is possible" and more power to them.

Room in the great wide world (whether 5000 years old or not) for all of us, and no need to argue who is right.

Gassho, Jundo

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

rachmiel said:

Malcolm, ultimately yes, conventionally no.

Malcolm wrote:

And a convention, does it indicate something real?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: Emptiness

Content:

rachmiel said:

But (imo) there IS no owner of these parts, there is only a set of processes that happen to exist in an interdependent web. Flower points to this web of processes.

SpinyNorman said:

A phrase I've found helpful is: "No things, only processes." Or perhaps just one big process?

Malcolm wrote:

There aren't even processes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 3:45 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

smcj said:

Sounds to me he was barking up the right tree. Too bad nobody ever told him that Rigpa was self-aware without any duality. It would have saved him a whole lot of work that was wasted believing the subject/object duality was unavoidable.

Malcolm wrote:

To be self-aware automatically implies duality...its an even worse duality, since consciousness needs to take itself as an object...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 3:42 AM

Title: Re: Happy Zhang Zhung Losar !

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

- Could you explain the difference here between Tsulug and Phulug ?

Malcolm wrote:

Simply put, they are two different systems of calculating the calendar based on the information in the commentary on the Kalacakra Tantra called Vimalaprabha.

Bonpos identify three different Kalacakras: the Sūtra Kalacakra found in the Ziji, which I mentioned already, which details the formation of the eon and so forth. The Buddhist Kalacakra Tantra, and finally so called Kalacakra of oral instructions for calculating the years, months, days and hours, which is basically the elemental calculation we know today. In the Bon tradition, the last one was taught in China by the Bon version of Mañjuśrī, Mrawey Sengey, to Kongtse Trulgyal. In the Buddhist tradition, elemental calculation was taught by Mañjuśrī in China to Kongtse Trulgyal. The two systems are so similar, that in the Bonpo astrology manuals, constant reference is made to earlier Buddhist texts, especially a Karma Kagyu text called the Bumzang, which is very popular in Eastern Tibet.

Really, about the only real difference between Bon and Buddhist astrology is the origin myths, and even here, the Bonpos include Sakyamuni as being one of the teachers of Kalacakra in general. A second difference is that the name Kalacakra is applied also to elemental calculation in the Bon tradition, but in the Buddhist tradition, elemental calculation and Kalacakra are regarded as being distinct and as having separate origins.

kalden yungdrung said:

Shambala seems to be a non-Buddhist Tradition which was received by an Indian King. The text would be fallen on the roof of his palace..... Well this seems to be a serious story.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, no. Sakyamuni is said to have taught Kalacakra in South India, and the Shambala king was present for that teaching, and he returned home with it and taught it in Shambhala widely.

Code: #

If Bön would follow the Tsurpu tradition, what would this mean ?

It means that they followed the Karma Kagyu system of calculating calendars, that's all. It is just a kind of math.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

smcj said:

But no, areligious humanists have put a huge amount of work into trying to establish a code of ethics that is fundamentally justified beyond simply saying "That's how I would like it to be". To the best of my knowledge they have not been able to do so.

Malcolm wrote:

You apparently have never heard of Kant.

smcj said:

Actually I prefer Sartre, who predicates his ideas on the duality of subject/object relationship of mind. In other words his philosophy is based on the idea that Mahamudra/Dzogchen is impossible, but its' still a worthy effort.

Malcolm wrote:

Sarte is not a serious philosopher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 3:23 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You then follow this up with "I just don't believe in rebirth." This is a statement of opinion, but it is not an argument.

jundo cohen said:

Hi Malcolm,

I have quickly spelled out some of the reasons why I doubt detailed, traditional models of Buddhist Rebirth. That is an argument.

Malcolm wrote:

No, they are a list of qualms. Qualms and doubts are not arguments.

jundo cohen said:

However, putting aside my shorthand summary, some others have spelled out more detailed arguments and evidence against:

If we take that time period back to the aeons of cosmic contraction and expansion, the problems only ramify. Around 700,000 to a million lifetimes and we are into the pre-hominid.

At this point there is certainly no developed language, and the bodhisatta would have had no name. He could only have been one or another variety of animal, but even so, animals only go back about 600-700 million years.

Prior to that it's not clear the bodhisatta could have been reborn on Earth, at least that would be the case if we assume that only animals have the consciousness available for kamma and rebirth.

Of course, the Buddha could have been reborn on other planes or planets, but once again there is no mention of vast divergences in body plan, language, culture, or surroundings that would indicate such a rebirth. Indeed, the evidence provided in MN 39 is consistent with a world in which humans always existed in a way much as in the Buddha's own time. If this is evidence for rebirth, it is not very convincing. More convincing would have been some otherwise inexplicable stories about social, linguistic, and morphological change as the Buddha retreated into memories of the distant past.

<http://secularbuddhism.org/2013/05/29/a-secular-evaluation-of-rebirth/>

Malcolm wrote:

This amounts to saying, "Since Homer couched the events of Troy using the contemporary morays of his day, this should cause us to have great doubts about whether Troy existed."

Also there are a huge number of assumptions in the above, themselves liable to be faulted.

jundo cohen said:

Now let us go back to the case of young Lama Osel and his predecessor. Although one hypothesis to explain his appearance in Lama Zopa's dream, and his choice of the right rosary, is that he is the reincarnation of Lama Thubten Yeshe, could we not conceive of an alternative hypothesis that would be no less problematic than the theory of rebirth? One has to remember the environment in which Lama Osel has been brought up. From a very early age he has been immersed in images of Lama Yeshe and the world of Tibetan Buddhism (like the photo he referred to in the interview), subjected to high-profile media attention because of his having been identified as a tulku, and surrounded by people with a high investment in believing that he is the reincarnation of their teacher. Let us imagine that the child is simply responding to the expectations of the adults around him. He already knows that when he makes certain gestures or speaks in a certain tone of voice, those who care for him will exclaim with joy, "Oh, that's just like Lama Yeshe!" So when this sensitive child is confronted with a range of rosaries, could he not simply be responding to the hopes and expectations of his audience—none of whom are indifferent to the outcome? One wonders if the same tests were run under laboratory conditions in the presence of neutral observers whether the results would be the same.

<http://www.stephenbatchelor.org/index.php/en/rebirth-a-case-for-buddhist-agnosticism>

Malcolm wrote:

This is an irrelevant example. Buddha himself never spoke of such an institution of recognizing tulkus, but when Maudgalyāyana inquired of the Buddha where his mother had taken birth, the Buddha was able to answer him.

Thus, the institution of recognizing reincarnations has no bearing on whether or not rebirth is a fact of being a sentient being.

jundo cohen said:

However, I do not want to rehash the arguments, and simply point out that to some of us these beliefs are not necessary, and there is some basis in old texts for claiming the illusory nature of the whole thing.

Malcolm wrote:

And yet you refuse to take the illusory nature of the whole thing to its logical conclusion...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 3:14 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

smcj said:

But no, areligious humanists have put a huge amount of work into trying to establish a code of ethics that is fundamentally justified beyond simply saying "That's how I would like it to be". To the best of my knowledge they have not been able to do so.

Malcolm wrote:

You apparently have never heard of Kant.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 3:12 AM

Title: Re: Happy Zhang Zhung Losar !

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Thanks for your explanation Malcolm.

The astrological calendar is important to know regarding time tables.

But it is amazing that we can speak here about two "different" systems.

The only time calculation i know until the very moment is the Kalachakra system.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and there are two systems of calculating the yearly calendar based on this, Tshulug and Phuglug.

kalden yungdrung said:

Kalachakra system is in Bön also known but not seen as highest Tantra etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, because it comes from the 20th chapter of the Ziji, and this text was a terma not revealed until the 14th century, nearly 400 hundred years after the Kalacakra Tantra was introduced to Tibet.

kalden yungdrung said:

So i guess that Kalachakra connects Bön with Kagyud maybe.

Malcolm wrote:

It seems the Bonpos follow the system developed at Tshurphu.

kalden yungdrung said:

But how are the astrological sytems of the other Tibetan Traditions explained and why they maybe could differ, that would be interesting to know.

Malcolm wrote:

The difference lies in the calculations are made. No system of Tibetan astrology is actually based on how the stars move in the sky.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

I think another point central to this topic is the question: why exactly do we feel the need to create a label "Buddhism" and then judge who is inside this circle and who isn't? I get that all of us are following teachings that are traced back to the same guy... But at some point, it seems like a little too much to have long debates about which labels apply to whom. Just my two cents.

Simon E. said:

I would suggest that no one is doing that. What some are doing is pointing to Buddhadharma as given. It is an individual matter whether one internalises that Dharma or substitutes something else.

tomamundsen said:

Doesn't the title of this topic assume that is going on to some extent? If we haven't created the label of Buddhism, then what are we talking about that is changing? And if we aren't labeling certain traditions or people as non-Buddhist based on their changes, then what exactly is this conversation about?

Malcolm wrote:

Some people will obviously depart from the Dharma because they adopt principles which run counter to the basic tenets the Buddha taught.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 2:46 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

I think another point central to this topic is the question: why exactly do we feel the need to create a label "Buddhism" and then judge who is inside this circle and who isn't? I get that all of us are following teachings that are traced back to the same guy... But at some point, it seems like a little too much to have long debates about which labels apply to whom. Just my two cents.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not the point. But regardless of what anyone personally believes, rebirth is a tenet of Buddhadharma which is nonnegotiable. So when people express their lack of confidence in the Buddha's teaching, their understanding of those teachings are likely

to be called into question, and even whether or not they are actually people who are following the Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So far, you have not pointed out anything which represents a coherent negation of rebirth. So if you can't refute it, you should accept it.

jundo cohen said:

That is the logical fallacy of argument from ignorance.

Malcolm wrote:

No one said, "You should accept the flying spaghetti monster as real because you cannot prove it is false."

But we are discussing a premise the Buddha taught, and since you have not presented any coherent argument against this premise, you should accept it.

You have said only "The Buddha, while enlightened, might be wrong about this and other things." But this is also another fallacy, "Poisoning the well."

You then follow this up with "I just don't believe in rebirth." This is a statement of opinion, but it is not an argument.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 2:06 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I am merely pointing out to you that you keeping placing limitations, mostly material, on the limitless.

jundo cohen said:

You are correct. Howeverm although there is that which is limitless, it that does not mean that whatever fantastic thing human beings may imagine is necessary the actual state of affairs. It does not mean that Obama was born in Nigeria or that Jesus walked on water. 'Granted, perhaps in some alternate universe there is a Pres. Obama born in their Nigeria, etc.). Even if the Buddha and Jesus got together to say Obama was born in Nigeria, I do not think that would make it so (granted, I just doubt it and it is not central to Practice).

Thus "limitless" does entail everything being true.

Malcolm wrote:

So far, you have not pointed out anything which represents a coherent negation of rebirth. So if you can't refute it, you should accept it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Thank you, Malcolm. It may be so. I celebrate your tightly held religious beliefs and personal philosophical positions.

do not preclude

"Does not preclude" is not the same as "is thus necessarily". It could be, just not so important to all of us in the Buddhist world.

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:

I am merely pointing out to you that you keeping placing limitations, mostly material, on the limitless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If there is no rebirth, there is no point to the Dharma, as Dogen makes very clear in Shobogenzo. It does not matter whether that rebirth is illusory or relative, in contrast to an ultimate state in which there is no birth or even death.

As long as we live in this illusion called birth and death, the point of Dharma practice is to put an end to the illusion of birth and death. As long as we are talking about illusory sentient beings, being illusory, their birth, death and transmigration functions from delusion about their own illusory nature. Otherwise, if rebirth is rejected, you are placing hard, material limitations on something which you argue is not actually real at all. This is an internal contradiction in your thinking.

jundo cohen said:

Hi Malcolm,

I have no trouble with any of this. This is what I teach in our little Sangha.

The only question I hold (and likely share with most skeptics on this issues in the Buddhist world) concerns very detailed models of rebirth in which, once this corpse is dumped in the grave, my soulless stream of Karmic effects comes back as a bunny rabbit, Asura, a god somewhere over Mt. Sumeru (another hard to defend model of reality that Buddhism has pretty much learned to survive without) or a prisoner of the ice hell.

Not important to Practice. Take that or leave that. If I come back as a bunny, please give me a carrot. We are dying and reborn in each moment, and we create endless little heavens and hells for ourselves and for others in this life by our volitional words, thoughts and acts. We need to see through all that, plus through the life and death of the grave. That's enough.

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:

There is and only ever has been one model of rebirth in Buddhadharma. You keep conflating cosmology with the principle of punarbhāva, rebirth. The former is not necessary to the latter.

One, in Mahāyāna it is maintained that the three realms are mind only. This includes the six lokas, features such as Mt. Meru and so on, including the perception you have of your own sense organs, body and so on. According to Mahāyāna, all of these perceptions and experiences arise from traces activated in the all-basis consciousness.

Now that we have removed physicality and cosmology from the equation, we can understand that the apparent death of our physical body is not a death of a physical body, rather it is the cessation of the perception of a physical body we have now and in this life time. But given that we accept, as Mahāyānists, that all phenomena are only mind, the exhaustion of this life's appearances do not preclude the arising of the appearance of a new series of aggregates to our consciousness, whether or not we have any memory of a past life.

Descarte had it wrong, there is no demon in the mix; but there are afflictions in the mix, and for as long as the traces of those afflictions contaminate our minds streams, then for us there is no end to birth and death.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Hi Malcolm,

Eyes and ears ... drowning or not drowning ...

I am still not sure what that has to do with whether very detailed models of rebirth are actually so, and whether it is central to Buddhist Practice.

A life preserver I can see and, dream or not, it seems to keep me afloat in the stormy sea (dream or not).

If someone else thinks that "rebirth" floats their boat and keeps them afloat in the stormy samsaric sea, then I salute them if they can clutch on to that. Good for them. Likewise for someone who believes in flying elephants that may swoop by and save one from drowning, good for them.

Whatever keeps you afloat.

Gassho, Jundo

Malcolm wrote:

If there is no rebirth, there is no point to the Dharma, as Dogen makes very clear in Shobogenzo. It does not matter whether that rebirth is illusory or relative, in contrast to an ultimate state in which there is no birth or even death.

One does not cling to rebirth as a raft. In this, you have it wrong. It is quite the opposite. Rebirth is itself the stormy ocean of samsara, from which one seeks rescue via the raft of Dharma.

As long as we live in this illusion called birth and death, the point of Dharma practice is to put an end to the illusion of birth and death. As long as we are talking about illusory sentient beings, being illusory, their birth, death and transmigration functions from delusion about their own illusory nature. Otherwise, if rebirth is rejected, you are placing hard, material limitations on something which you argue is not actually real at all. This is an internal contradiction in your thinking.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

So you do not believe the world to be illusory after all.

jundo cohen said:

This is a great Koan ... it is yet not yet it is ...

... and so many aspects of the world exist largely between the ears and behind the eyes

(I doubt an ant would worry about rebirth and all this debate) ...

Malcolm wrote:

So your eyes and ears are not illusory.

jundo cohen said:

The world is illusory but then some things are even more illusory!

Malcolm wrote:

You sound like a person who, while drowning, argues over whether some water is more watery than other water.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 12:45 AM

Title: Re: Happy Zhang Zhung Losar !

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Phuglug Losar, followed by Gelugpas, Sakyapas, and Nyingmapas, comes next month.

tomamundsen said:

Nyingmapas from Eastern Bhutan observed it yesterday.

Malcolm wrote:

Then they too are following Tshurlug. Most Tibetans however will celebrate this on February 8th.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are on shaky ground with these citations, Jundo. If you accept illusory sentient beings, why not accept their equally illusory birth, death and transmigration?

No one can doubt that illusory elephants in shadow play never experience birth, death and transmigration, but no one doubts that appearance of illusory elephants arise, abide, perish and then reappear elsewhere in another show.

jundo cohen said:

Hi Malcolm,

I am not sure of your elephantine point here. Just because I dream of pink flying elephants who are reborn each night in my dreams, or read about them in an old sacred text (or see one in an old Disney movie which repeats when I put in a DVD) does not mean that there are actually pink flying elephants in this world born or reborn.

Malcolm wrote:

So you do not believe the world to be illusory after all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 12:18 AM

Title: Re: Happy Zhang Zhung Losar !

Content:

tingdzin said:

I wasn't aware there was a Losar different from the Tibetan one. More information, please!

Malcolm wrote:

The Bonpo Losar and the Karma Kagyu Losar fall on the same day. This is because Bonpo astrologers follow Tshurlug, rather than Phuglug.

The Phuglug Losar, followed by Gelugpas, Sakyapas, and Nyingmapas, comes next month.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 12th, 2016 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You are on shaky ground with these citations, Jundo. If you accept illusory sentient beings, why not accept their equally illusory birth, death and transmigration?

No one can doubt that illusory elephants in shadow play never experience birth, death and transmigration, but no one doubts that appearance of illusory elephants arise, abide, perish and then reappear elsewhere in another show.

jundo cohen said:

Heart Sutra:

No old age and death, no [start nor] cessation of old age and death [because empty]

Vimalakirti Sutra

"The Dharma knows nothing of living beings, because it is removed from the defilement of such concepts as "living beings." The Dharma knows nothing of "I," because it is removed from the defilement of such concepts as "I." It knows nothing of a life span, because it knows nothing of birth and death. It knows nothing of individuality, because it is cut off from considerations of past or future lives. The Dharma is forever still and serene, because it has wiped out all characteristics.

...

Shariputra said to the goddess, "When your present existence comes to an end, where will you be reborn?"

The goddess replied, "The way the Buddha is born in his transformation body-that's how I'll be born."

Shariputra said, "When the Buddha is born in his transformation body, it is not a matter of birth or death.

The goddess said, "It's that way with living beings too-they are without birth or death."

...

The bodhisattva Good Will said, "The realm of birth and death and that of nirvana form a dualism. But if one sees the true nature of birth and death, one sees that there is no birth or death, no binding, no unbinding, no birth, no extinction. One who understands in this way may thereby enter the gate of nondualism.

...

Again, the sutras enable one to practice the teachings as the Law directs, to accord with the twelve-linked chain of causation, to set aside erroneous views and accept the truth of birthlessness, to realize once and for all that there is no ego, no existence of living beings, no deviating from or disputing with the law of cause and effect, thus removing all thought of personal possession. They teach one to rely on meaning, not on words; to rely on wisdom, not on consciousness; to rely on sutras that are complete in meaning, not on those that are incomplete in meaning; to rely on the Law, not on the person; to go along with the true form of things, realizing that there is no entering in and no destination. They teach that, since ignorance in the end does not exist, so too action in the end does not exist, and so on through the other links in the twelve-linked chain of causation down to the fact that, since birth in the end does not exist, so too old age and death in the end do not exist. And when one learns to see in this manner, the twelve-linked chain of causation will cease to have any form that comes to an end, and one will no longer entertain the view that it does. This is called the finest of all offerings of the Law"

Surangama Sutra

While the (illusory) knower became a living being.í This is the origin of a living being.

Ever after, this living being grasped at his body and mind as his Ego. How then can he now

recognize his (essential) boundless True Mind? So in delusion, he thinks that his mind is in his

body. Since ,nanda clung to a mind within his body, he mistook this (illusory) mind for True Mind;
hence he saw only the Buddha's excellent characteristics which he admired but failed to realize that
neither body nor mind exist. As he relied on the five aggregates, he divided them wrongly into six
sense organs with corresponding sense data. He further clung to the four elements that produced
five sense data as his Ego's fields of activities, thereby (creating) six consciousnesses and indulging
in discriminations, illusions and karmic acts.
This was the origin of the cycle of births and deaths caused by attachment to body and mind
as an Ego.

...

Ē,nanda, you are still not clear about the illusory appearances
of all passing phenomena which vanish wherever
they arise. These illusions in the shape of forms spring from
(their underlying nature which is) the substance of wonderful
Bodhi. So also are the six entrances (organs), the twelve
āyatana (six sense organs and six sense data) and the eighteen
realms of senses which falsely arise from the mixture
and union of causes and conditions and which falsely vanish
when the same causes and conditions are disconnected.
They are but creation and destruction appearing and vanishing
within the permanent, wonderfully bright, immutable,
all-embracing and profound Bhūtatathatā (absolute) nature
of the Tathāgata store wherein neither coming nor going,
neither delusion nor enlightenment, and neither birth nor
death can be found.⁵

The Korean Son Teacher Chinul:

: Birth and death are originally nonexistent; they exist because of a
false notion. It is like a person with diseased eyes who sees flowers in the
sky. If a person without this disease says there are no flowers in the sky, the
afflicted person will not believe it. But if his disease is cured, the flowers in
the sky will vanish naturally and he can then accept that they were nonexistent.
Although the flowers he sees have not yet vanished, they are, in fact,
still void. It is only the sick man who takes them to be flowers; their essence
does not really exist.

In the same way, people wrongly assume that birth and death exist. If a
man free of birth and death tells them that birth and death are originally
nonexistent, they will not believe him. But one morning, if delusion is put to
rest, and birth and death are spontaneously abandoned, they will realize
that birth and death are originally nonexistent. It is only when birth and
death are not yet ended that, although they do not really exist, they seem to
exist because of this false conceptualization. As a sutra says:

Men of good family! Since time immemorial all sentient beings have been subject to all kinds of inverted views. They are like people who have confused the four directions. They wrongly assume that the four elements are their own bodies. They regard the shadows conditioned by the six sense-objects as their own minds. This is like diseased eyes which see flowers in the sky. Yet even if all the flowers in the sky were to vanish from space, it still could not be said that they actually vanished. And why is this? Because they never came into existence in the first place. All sentient beings mistakenly perceive an arising and a ceasing within this non-rising state. For this reason, it is called the revolving wheel of birth and death."

According to the text of this sutra, we can be sure that if we have a penetrating awakening to the true mind of complete enlightenment, then, as originally, there is no birth or death.

We know now that there is no birth and death; but still we cannot liberate ourselves from birth and death because our practice is imperfect. As it says in the texts, Ambapali once asked Mañjuśrī, "I can understand that birth is actually the unborn dharma, but why then am I still subject to the flow of birth and death?" Mañjuśrī answered, "It is because your power is still insufficient." The mountain master Chin asked the mountain master Hsü, "I understand that birth is actually the unborn dharma, but why am I still subject to the flow of birth and death?" Hsü replied, "Bamboo shoots eventually become bamboo. But can you use them now to make a raft?" Accordingly, to know that there is no birth or death is not as good as to experience that there is no birth or death. To experience that there is no birth or death is not as good as to be in conformity with the birthless and the deathless. To be in conformity with the birthless and the deathless is not as good as to make use of the birthless and the deathless. People nowadays do not even know that there is no birth or death, let alone experience, be in conformity with, or make use of the birthless and the deathless. Is it not only natural, then, that people who assume there really is birth and death would not be able to believe in the birthless and deathless dharma?

<http://terebess.hu/zen/mesterek/Collected-Works-of-Chinul.pdf>

One can find countless such passages in imaginary Sutras and Shastra within this dream.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 11th, 2016 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

Actually, Malcolm, the question (both in the OP and in this part of the discussion) was "really whether Theravada is superior or inferior," and you have skidded deftly away from it.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that before we can even begin to address the question of inferiority, etc., we

first have to evaluate whether Theravada fits the Mahāyāna description of a Hināyāna school.

Kim O'Hara said:

Why on earth do you feel you need to do that?

As I just said, "as soon as a path (team, race, ...) is defined as "other" it is, almost automatically, defined as inferior" and 99% of the rest is mere rationalisation. It's another manifestation of good old-fashioned clinging, really - my path, my nationality, my identity.

If you can point us towards some standards by which to judge the superiority or inferiority of a religious path - from outside that religion - I would be delighted. But if you can only argue Mahayana's superiority from within Mahayana, your arguments are fatally tainted by the stink of self-justification.

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, the first step is to see whether or not Theravada fulfills the criteria that the Mahāyāna lays out for what a Hināyāna path might look like.

This can be evaluated in two ways:

1) There are two results to which one can aspire in Buddhadharma, arhatship and buddhahood. The path of arhatship, as everyone knows, does not lead to buddhahood. The bodhisattva path does lead to buddhahood.

2) It is claimed that the bodhisattva path is superior to the arhat path because the former results in buddhahood while the latter does not.

The Agama/Nikāya sutras teach only the arhat path. The principles of the bodhisattva path are not taught not in those sūtras, as observed by Nāgārjuna in the Ratnavali. Only Mahāyāna sūtras teach the bodhisattva path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 11th, 2016 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Saoshun said:

Many people do not realize even stream-entry so what is point to discuss inferiority of things if you do not realize even basics fruits of hinayana?

Actually everyone miss the point here, everyone. The question like this appeared back in history because people was realized not only on intellectual level like here, just talking. They have fruits of hinayana that's why buddha said that there is something more and put them on check. The question you raised is only raised to someone who realized fruits of hinayana no other ways. For regular person is does not matter.

Malcolm wrote:

For regular persons this is indeed an important issue. For example, as I mentioned before, if you take the bodhisattva path, according to Theravada ideas, you cut yourself off from the possibility of stream entry, and thus, if you elect to follow the bodhisattva path, you are barred from the basic fruits of the path for eons, until you achieve full buddhahood. Therefore, as a regular person, it is indeed important to know the differences in presentation between Mahāyāna and Śrāvakayāna schools like Theravada concerning such things the path and so on so one can make an informed choice.

It is just not the case at all that the paths of all common people are alike in every respect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 11th, 2016 at 10:45 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

Actually, Malcolm, the question (both in the OP and in this part of the discussion) was "really whether Theravada is superior or inferior," and you have skidded deftly away from it.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that before we can even begin to address the question of inferiority, etc., we first have to evaluate whether Theravada fits the Mahāyāna description of a Hināyāna school.

Kim O'Hara said:

Why on earth do you feel you need to do that?

Malcolm wrote:

Because the question has been raised.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 11th, 2016 at 7:02 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

Actually, Malcolm, the question (both in the OP and in this part of the discussion) was "really whether Theravada is superior or inferior," and you have skidded deftly away from it.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that before we can even begin to address the question of inferiority, etc., we first have to evaluate whether Theravada fits the Mahāyāna description of a Hināyāna school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 11th, 2016 at 4:10 AM

Title: Re: A re-introduction

Content:

mindyourmind said:

Um, well...

I've been away so long that I feel that I should re-introduce myself. Due to the loss of loved ones and experiencing the daily and increasing suffering of my best friend, I spent the last three years pretty much in a dark hole, with lots of doubt, anger, experimentation, far too much intellectualization, self-pity and other very ugly sentiments. Through it all, thankfully, I have managed to hold on to my own daily Dzogchen and Mahamudra practices, even though I had hardly any contact with my teachers or dharma centers during this time. In a sense I feel that I could have dealt with this better, in another odd sense I however also sense some big breakthrough, some bigger understanding of many things.

Sorry for the boring personal stuff, just wanted to let you know where I've been, and that I'm back.

X

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 11th, 2016 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

SpinyNorman said:

From a pan-Buddhist perspective claims of inferiority and superiority just look like sectarianism.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as a Pan-Buddhist perspective.

SpinyNorman said:

I've been involved with all the main Buddhist schools over a period of 35 years, that's what I mean by a pan-Buddhist perspective. I've seen too many claims of superiority over the years, frankly it's boring.

Malcolm wrote:

The question here is not really whether Theravada is superior or inferior. The question is whether it is fair to include Theravada among the schools counted as "Hinayāna" in Indian Mahāyāna polemical literature.

Caodmarte's contention is that it is anachronistic to make this claim because, according to him, Theravada did not exist to be a butt of those critiques. Of course, this contention is false, since the rise of Theravada coincides with the rise of Mahāyāna. The earliest self-conscious use of the term we know of is in the Dīpavamsa where Theravada is identified as one of the 18 schools.

There is a prevailing BC attitude where it is considered wrong to include Theravada among the other schools classically identified in Mahāyāna polemical writings as Hināyāna. My point is that this attitude is wrong. Anyone who belongs to any ordination lineage [of the three remaining] can be a Mahāyānist providing they reject certain points of view of the bodhisattva path which are shared among all eighteen schools, and accept the Mahāyāna account of the bodhisattva path in their stead since the two perspectives about this are mutually exclusive.

There are many different teachings for people of many different capacities in Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 11th, 2016 at 3:18 AM

Title: Re: Music time

Content:

Malcolm 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: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 10th, 2016 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche: Advice to three-year retreatant

Content:

kirtu said:

Many people have had DI and yet are habitually unkind and harm others (esp. verbally). There is at least one great guru who actually seems to attract many people with this specific flaw.

Kirt

Virgo said:

Who would that be?

Kevin

Malcolm wrote:

I imagine that he is referring to Dzongsar Khyentse.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 10th, 2016 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Boomerang said:

Theravada Buddhists say that Mahayana Buddhists say that Theravada is an inferior vehicle, and that Theravadins are selfish or lacking in compassion. How well does this idea match the views of the Mahayana Buddhists on this forum? I don't feel like it's inferior; the best path is whatever you are drawn to. There may be Mahayana sutras which extravagantly expound that Hinayana is lesser, but I would be surprised and confused to go to a dharma talk and hear a Mahayana teacher give a whole lecture about how Mahayana is better than Theravada. There are also texts that say the Buddha cut off his flesh as a bodhisattva, but that doesn't mean Mahayanis like to cut off their flesh. So, when Theravada Buddhists say this I sort of feel like it's a sound bite and stereotype.

SpinyNorman said:

From a pan-Buddhist perspective claims of inferiority and superiority just look like sectarianism.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no such thing as a Pan-Buddhist perspective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 10th, 2016 at 9:00 PM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Caodemarte said:

Although phrased rather dramatically by Kalupahana (one of the giants of Buddhist studies), it is quite reasonable to argue that the ideas of the Mulamadhyamakakarika were in no way meant to be or seen to be revolutionary in any way, but were natural expressions of (or mild natural developments of) early Buddhist thought. It is almost certain that Nagarjuna would not have thought of himself as a Mahayanist although claimed as such after his death (reminds me of the truism that Jesus was not a Christian), but rather as a Buddhist intellectual expounding the orthodox wisdom of his day against those whose views had strayed into heretical error inconsistent with Buddhist thought. Of course, it is very difficult, if not flat out impossible, to believe that Nagarjuna or later Theravada or Mahayana Buddhist thinkers would have said anything that they thought contradicted orthodox early Buddhist thought.

Malcolm wrote:

Clearly Nāgārjuna thought of himself as a Mahāyānist, just read the Mahāyāna Vimsika, the Ratnavali, or the Surhlekha.

Just as clearly, Kalupahana's treatment of the MMK is severely flawed by his refusal to use the Indian commentarial tradition, and reading passages in direct opposition to what that maintains, breaking up the question and answer format of the MMK. For example, on egregious error DK makes is that he asserts that Nāgārjuna does not reject the four conditions outlined by the Sarvastivadins, the latter embraces them. There are many other interpretive mistakes that DK makes.

[
Caodemarte said:
Studies on comparative subjects like the Bodhisattva concept in Mahayana and in Theravada (yes, there is a bodhisattva concept in Theravada) have greatly increased our understanding of both Mahayana and Theravada as well as the deep connections between them.

Malcolm wrote:
Of course there is a bodhisattva concept in Theravada, just as there is one in all the Hinayāna schools. For example, the Abhidharmakosha narrates the career of the bodhisattva at the end of one chapter. It exists in Hinayāna schools because Buddha was once a bodhisattva. But their concept could not be more different than the Mahāyāna ideal.

But this is not the issue before us. The issue is: is there anything which exempts Theravada from Mahāyāna polemics which were aimed at its forbears? The answer is no. There is nothing doctrinally unique about Theravada, as opposed to Sarvastivada, which renders it immune to inclusion among the Hinayāna schools.

There is however these days a BC (Buddhist Correctness) movement to try and pretend that Theravada does not belong to the Hinayāna schools based on some putative idea that since it was outside the main stream developments in India, it is also somehow outside these criticisms. Nothing could be further from the truth. The very ideas put forth in the Abhidhammapitika, the realism of the Visuddhimagga, etc., are exactly the targets of Mahāyāna theoretical polemicists like Nāgārjuna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 10th, 2016 at 11:03 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Caodemarte said:

Are you saying that any non-Mahayanist is by definition a Hinayanist?

Malcolm wrote:

One, Hinayāna schools are defined by ordination lineage. Second, any person of any ordination lineage may adopt Mahāyāna, but all the eighteen schools and their

offshoots are by definition Hinayāna schools because they favor pursuit of the arhat path over pursuit of full Buddhahood.

I already gave my definition of a Hinayāna practitioner above, i.e., someone who chooses arhatship over full Buddhahood. There are a number of other criteria, but the latter is the most important.

For example, while many people make much noise about the fact that indeed one can adopt the bodhisattva path in Theravada (as well as the rest of the Nikāya/Agamic schools), the barriers to doing so are no different than the barriers and conditions laid down in the Abhidharmakosha for someone who wishes to take up the bodhisattva path (must be male, must have been predicted by the Buddha during his lifetime, etc.). Such people are further barred from stream entry, etc. In other words, while compassion may not be lacking in the Theravada path, bodhicitta is.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 10th, 2016 at 8:58 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Caodemarte said:

I doubt anyone would claim Theravada was immune from criticism. However, there is no evidence that Theravada was one of the traditional 18 schools (or the 17 to 19 if you count differently).

It is often claimed by non-scholars in Theravada countries (Sri Lankans seem big on this) that Theravada is a direct descendant of Sthaviravada (both names mean the same thing). However, when you probe this it comes down to at best, "inspired" by Sthaviravada. Theravadins assume that Sthaviravada was the oldest Buddhist school and therefore assume it must be the most correct and therefore must have taught Theravada since Theravada is correct (all this may be true but is hardly an historical or convincing argument to non-Theravadins) . It is akin to the claim that Theravada started at the 1st Council. Since this is impossible the claim becomes the more historical idea that the 1st council and what Theravada "reformers" thought was taught served as a distant inspiration, apparently primarily because the Theravada "reformers" had an interpretation of what happened which agreed with Theravadin theories!

"There is no historical evidence that the Theravada school arose until around two centuries after the Great Schism which occurred at the Council of Pataliputra" (Oxford Dictionary of Buddhism, 2003). To claim that they are the descendants of Sthaviravada is similar to claims you occasionally read that Sri Lanka has always been a Theravada country (which is true if you ignore the Tantric monuments and other obvious historical evidence!). But even that date is controversial and is probably too early.

So if you want to criticize Theravada (a school with many traditions, but let's treat it as a

more or less coherent unit for our purposes) as a Hinayana school using your definition of what that means you will first have to understand what a Theravadin would describe as Theravadin goals and what is meant by "arhathood" and Buddhahood by the tradition. This is an immense task, but you simply can't claim with intellectual honesty that they believe what a far-distant critic or a 19th Century Western scholar outside the tradition with no direct knowledge asserts they believe unless we are doing simple sect bashing. Then you can see how they contrast or share points with the Mahayana. For example, you have written they were "influenced by Nāgārjuna." Although I don't think Kalupahana would quite agree on who influenced who when, he argues that the Mahayana concept of emptiness and the Theravadin no-self, no substance are extremely similar, if not developments of the same idea in different language. There has been a lot of fascinating recent work on this topic.

Malcolm wrote:

You should read more carefully. I said that some modern Theravadins have been very influenced by Nāgārjuna.

That aside, Theravada subscribes to a Nikāya model of Buddhadharma. This makes them a Hinayāna school by definition.

From a Mahāyāna point of view, the Theravada claims about the nature of Buddhahood and the nature of Arhatship really are no different than what can be found in the Pali Canon's Katthavatthu, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 10th, 2016 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

jundo cohen said:

...yet the Dharmakaya is the Dharmakaya.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 10th, 2016 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Here, Jundo admits that he really has no idea what he is talking about...

jundo cohen said:

Well, it is a Koan, but one I believe I know the solution to. As the Buddha arguably pointed out in some of his writings (where he begged off answering certain types of questions), he was fully enlightened in key aspects, with insight into great matters, but I

would not ask him to tune my car or predict tomorrow's stock market ('probably beyond his expertise as a man of Iron Age India). As well, one can fully pierce some transcendent mysteries, be mistaken in the details. Again, Just a belief and I am not the last word in Buddhism (fortunately), nor do I fail to honor the possible truth of anyone else's beliefs on these matters.

Malcolm wrote:

When in doubt, rinse and repeat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 10th, 2016 at 4:42 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Caodemarte said:

Although there are varying definitions, it is clear that the term was very definitely applied to schools as a criticism, 17 to 19 specific schools by name, if memory serves.

Theravada was not among the targeted schools as it did not exist at the time. In modern times Theravada has been misidentified being one of these specific schools or incorrectly categorized as holding the beliefs, as defined by ancient Mahayana critics, of one or another of the extinct schools. The question as to how Theravada as a school is fundamentally different in goals or philosophical beliefs from Mahayana in other than lineage and history is a surprisingly difficult and subtle question as Kalupahana and others kept and keep pointing out.

Malcolm wrote:

Umm, this is not correct. Theravada is the descendent of Sthaviravādas, which itself is a descendent of Vibhayavādins.

The positions that modern day Theravadins hold, apart from where they are influenced by Nāgārjuna, are not significantly different than the positions held in the Katthavattu and so on. Claiming therefore that Theravadins are exempt from Mahāyana criticisms is a flaw in thinking. In reality, Theravadins are one of the so called eighteen schools, as they count their ordination lineage from Upali.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 10th, 2016 at 2:23 AM

Title: Re: Chatral Rinpoche's passing

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Letter from Yangsi Dudjom Rinpoche Sangye Pema Zhepa:

http://www.vajrayana.org/media/files/box/3a87ed38/Yangsi_Rinpoche_on_Chatral_Rinpoche_s_parinirvana.pdf

Letter from Lama Sonam Rinpoche:

<http://www.vajrayana.org/files/556/>

Malcolm wrote:

I like his last testament:

First, do not search for a reincarnation after I have passed. Second, all of you must not be sad.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 10th, 2016 at 1:58 AM

Title: Re: Is Theravada an inferior and selfish vehicle?

Content:

Caodemarte said:

So the the short answer is no. You or I can certainly be inferior or selfish. But then we would not be good practitioners of any form of Buddhism!

This all probably comes from the misidentification of the Theravada with Hinayana. Hinayana comes the early polemical wars in early Indian Buddhism and was a put down by Mahayanists of an attitude or a whole sect. The schools it was used against died out as did the polemics before Theravada came to be and I don't believe it was ever applied to (what became) Theravada in India. Western scholars originally thought Theravada was one of the old, extinct schools and that is how why introduced Theravada to the West (and to Japan) as Hinayana Buddhism in modern times. A lot of that got channeled back to Theravada countries and early modern Thai Buddhist writers would say we must be Hinayana. No one believes that now and Hinayana is applied to an attitude, regardless of sect, and not to a contemporary group.

Malcolm wrote:

Hinayāna applies specifically to the goal of attaining an Arhat's cessation, rather than a school. So you do the math. What is the primary goal of a Theravadin? If it is not full Buddhahood, than that practitioner has a Hinayāna motivation.

By inference, schools which do not advocate the attainment of full Buddhahood as a goal are Hinayāna no matter when they existed or in what country.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 9th, 2016 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Samayasattva/Jnanasattva

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

A Buddhas appearances are wisdom.

tomamundsen said:

Sure. But I thought appearances have ended for Buddhas, no?

Malcolm wrote:

No. What has ended for a Buddha are impure appearances.

tomamundsen said:

I thought that "appearance" implies a duality between the wisdom itself and the appearance of that wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:

That is true only below the 13th bhumi. The difference between a buddha on the thirteenth bhumi and the eleventh and twelfth bhumi is that buddhas on the thirteenth bhumi experience appearances as their own wisdom, whereas the lower two stages of buddhahood experience wisdom and the appearances as distinct.

tomamundsen said:

Or are these "path appearances" something asserted by everyone aside from the guy on the path of Buddhahood himself? I'm having a hard time adding that one up too though, because I didn't think Dharmakaya is "seen" by anyone but a Buddha. Hmmm.

Malcolm wrote:

The path of Buddhahood is called "the path of no further training. " Hence Buddhahood is also a path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 9th, 2016 at 9:30 PM

Title: Re: Not a vegetarian debate!

Content:

Saoshun said:

In samadhi you are beyond skandhas in your experience.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am afraid this is a wrong idea.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 9th, 2016 at 9:04 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarbha = Shentong

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

Was Kongtrul of lesser intelligence?

Malcolm wrote:

I was merely citing what Longchenpa stated, and his statement echoes what the Buddha says about tathāgatagarbha in the Lanka-avatara sūtra.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, January 9th, 2016 at 8:51 PM
Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong
Content:

smcj said:

This principle is the pinnacle of all views of the vehicle of causal characteristics.
"Vehicle of causal characteristics" modifies the statement somewhat.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, and gzhan stong belongs to that vehicle.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, January 9th, 2016 at 8:49 PM
Title: Re: Samayasattva/Jnanasattva
Content:

conebeckham said:

Can one say it is a "result appearance?" as well?

Or, perhaps, it's more appropriate to say that the moment "it appears" then there are no more "appearances."

Hmmm...

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is a path appearance, the path of buddhahood spans three to six bhumis, depending on the system.

tomamundsen said:

Does "appearance" here mean the same thing it normally does? I am a little perplexed if so. How can a Buddha be said to perceive appearances? Don't appearances end when non-dual wisdom is completely realized? I thought that appearance implies a duality from wisdom itself and that Buddhas have eliminated that.

Malcolm wrote:

A Buddhas appearances are wisdom.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, January 9th, 2016 at 6:41 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong
Content:

Matt J said:

Actually, Malcolm's critiques are more or less in line with those of Ju Mipham, who was a student of Kongtrul. Mipham rejects affirming negations and considers Longchenpa a

Prasangika who likewise upholds the supremacy of non-affirming negations. Mipham's critiques are often squarely leveled at how Dolpopa constructs and separates his two truths, and not just the three natures. Mipham is no slouch, so I don't think he was just wiping away the distinction, but arrived at his conclusions carefully.

sherabpa said:

I finally took a look at Brunnholzl's book, the one originally referenced in this thread, and was pleased to see a translation of Kongtrul's 'Vajra Moon' there. You can see on p832 where he references Longchenpa, and Brunnholzl's note 2661.

Don't take anyone else's word for Kongtrul's opinions on this or any matter. Look for yourselves. If I have misrepresented him, you can see it for yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is indeed Kongtrul's opinion, no one disputed that this was his opinion. What is under dispute is whether his opinion about Longchenpa is correct. I don't think that it is, and I think there is ample internal evidence in Longchenpa's writings that he was not a gzhan stong pa. As we have already seen, he identifies Candrakīrti as the one who holds the definitive view of Madhyamaka on page 798 of the grub mtha' mdzod. He declares on pg. 821, in the section devoted to explicating Candrakīrti's perspective: This principle is the pinnacle of all views of the vehicle of causal characteristics. It is simply inconsistent to maintain that someone who clearly articulates that the pinnacle of cause vehicles views is Prasangika belongs to the gzhan stong persuasion. Longchenpa does state on page 900 that:

In response to including the needs of those of lower intelligence, this garbha is empty because it is empty of faults, conditioning and so on, but it is not an emptiness that discards the phenomena of its qualities, as already mentioned:

The characteristic of distinction is

is that the element is empty of the temporary [afflictions],

the characteristic of the absence of distinction

is not being empty of unsurpassed phenomena.

The pure element that has the nature of the limit of reality is unconditioned like space.

The happiness and suffering of samsara (supported on karma and affliction) appear like clouds. Moreover, the suffering because of improper afflicted mental activity is like a cloud. Since karma appears without any nature, it is like the aspect of a dream. The aggregates generated by karma and affliction are explained to be like illusions and clouds to remedy the grasping to one extreme of clinging to self. After that, since there arise five faults of clinging to the reifications of grasping to extremes in emptiness, in order to remove that, the tathagātagarba is explained...."

But frankly, the above statement by Longchenpa is simply not sufficient to place him in the gzhan stong camp, especially with reference to his declaration of the definitive Mahāyāna view above, and in light of the fact that he clearly indicates the purpose of the tathagatagarbha view is to make the Mahāyāna path acceptable to those of lesser intelligence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 9th, 2016 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Matt J said:

Actually, Malcolm's critiques are more or less in line with those of Ju Mipham, who was a student of Kongtrul. Mipham rejects affirming negations and considers Longchenpa a Prasangika who likewise upholds the supremacy of non-affirming negations. Mipham's critiques are often squarely leveled at how Dolpopa constructs and separates his two truths, and not just the three natures. Mipham is no slouch, so I don't think he was just wiping away the distinction, but arrived at his conclusions carefully.

sherabpa said:

I finally took a look at Brunnholzl's book, the one originally referenced in this thread, and was pleased to see a translation of Kongtrul's 'Vajra Moon' there. You can see on p832 where he references Longchenpa, and Brunnholzl's note 2661.

Don't take anyone else's word for Kongtrul's opinions on this or any matter. Look for yourselves. If I have misrepresented him, you can see it for yourself.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is indeed Kongtrul's opinion, no one disputed that this was his opinion. What is under dispute is whether his opinion is correct. I don't think that it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 9th, 2016 at 5:36 AM

Title: Re: Samayasattva/Jnanasattva

Content:

smcj said:

What's the difference between the Nirmanakaya (a physical buddha) and Sambhogakaya (a non-physical buddha)? Physicality.

Malcolm wrote:

Umm, actually, the external sambhogakāya, the one in Akanistha, has a physical body, composed of very subtle matter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 9th, 2016 at 3:02 AM

Title: Re: Samayasattva/Jnanasattva

Content:

smcj said:

If some guy reads this on the internet and then goes and kicks one of your teachers because they are "only path appearances", what would you think is lacking in their

understanding? Or would you think their understanding is correct and approve?

Malcolm wrote:

I think the person who wrote the question lacks some understanding of the principle involved.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 9th, 2016 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: How much should Buddhism Change?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Here, Jundo admits that he really has no idea what he is talking about...

boda said:

If the Buddha was fully realized (no longer ignorant), how could he have been wrong about so many core teachings?

jundo cohen said:

Yes, he was fully realized. That is a Koan, is it not? Fully realized, yet how could he have been possibly wrong about a few core teachings (I assume he taught them, which he likely did).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 9th, 2016 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: Samayasattva/Jnanasattva

Content:

smcj said:

Is the Nirmanakaya expedient means? Is the Dharmakaya expedient means? If not, then why single out the Sambogakaya for any other reason that it raises issues about faith that are uncomfortable for us.

Malcolm wrote:

The three kāyas are just path appearances.

smcj said:

If some guy reads this on the internet and then goes and kicks one of your teachers because they are "only expedient means", what would you think is lacking in their understanding? Or would you think their understanding is correct and approve?

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say they were expedient means. I said they were path appearances. So your question is actually a non sequitur.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 9th, 2016 at 1:47 AM

Title: Re: Samayasattva/Jnanasattva

Content:

conebeckham said:

Can one say it is a "result appearance?" as well?

Or, perhaps, it's more appropriate to say that the moment "it appears" then there are no more "appearances."

Hmmm...

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is a path appearance, the path of buddhahood spans three to six bhumis, depending on the system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 9th, 2016 at 1:41 AM

Title: Re: Samayasattva/Jnanasattva

Content:

smcj said:

Is the Nirmanakaya expedient means? Is the Dharmakaya expedient means? If not, then why single out the Sambogakaya for any other reason that it raises issues about faith that are uncomfortable for us.

Malcolm wrote:

The three kāyas are just path appearances.

conebeckham said:

The Dharmakaya is a "path appearance?"

No dispute regarding the form kayas, but.....

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, dharmakāya is also a path appearance. It appears on the path of buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 9th, 2016 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: Kilung Rinpoche - Practical Advice on Dzogchen Meditatio

Content:

Nosta said:

Nice instructions!

Should I get any transmission/empowerment whatever before doing that meditation?
The instructions are simple and direct, so, can I try it without any empowerment?

Malcolm wrote:

No direct introduction, no Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 9th, 2016 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Samayasattva/Jnanasattva

Content:

smcj said:

Is the Nirmanakaya expedient means? Is the Dharmakaya expedient means? If not, then why single out the Sambogakaya for any other reason that it raises issues about faith that are uncomfortable for us.

Malcolm wrote:

The three kāyas are just path appearances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 8th, 2016 at 11:56 PM

Title: Re: Samayasattva/Jnanasattva

Content:

smcj said:

Until then it is just our eagerness to fit Dharma into our comfort zones by negating the issue of faith...

Malcolm wrote:

Did you ever consider that your obsession with [other peoples'] faith is just a way of fitting Dharma into your own comfort zone?

smcj said:

The way my teacher have taught me, and they themselves practice, is what I consider Dharma. Since the purpose of this website is to discuss Mahayana and Vajrayana, it is appropriate to put forward the idea that there might be a problem with some of the interpretations expressed here that contradict the way I have been taught.

Malcolm wrote:

The horror...

smcj said:

I have never heard any of my teachers say anything even remotely like, "...but you don't need take that seriously because it is expedient means." I have heard that from Westerners and Westerners only.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you probably just don't get out that much...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 8th, 2016 at 11:12 PM

Title: Re: The "four methods" that prove the existence of future li

Content:

Aemilius said:

What is the source for these four logical reasons for future reincarnation?

The first and second sound slightly dubious. In the Sutra of the Seedling of Rice Maitreya says that a small cause can give a large result, like from a small seed a great tree grows.

Is this a cause of the similar type or not? A seed is not a tree.

In the process of Dependent Arising name and form are preceded by ignorance, karma formations and consciousness, which are very different in character from a material body.

Ignorance etc.. do not constitute a substantial cause.

There is no substantial cause in Buddhism, for the arising of Samsara, the Wheel of Life.

Malcolm wrote:

It means that wheat seeds only give rise to wheat sprouts, rice seeds only give rise to rice seedlings.

A "substantial" cause means that in this case the mind, which is defined as a dravya itself, like water, fire, air and earth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 8th, 2016 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: Samayasattva/Jnanasattva

Content:

smcj said:

Until then it is just our eagerness to fit Dharma into our comfort zones by negating the issue of faith...

Malcolm wrote:

Did you ever consider that your obsession with [other peoples'] faith is just a way of fitting Dharma into your own comfort zone?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 8th, 2016 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: Shakya Shri

Content:

gyamtsotrinle said:

Hii,

I would like to know if there is exists incarnation of great master Shakya Shri? And also is there still available some of Shakya Shri 'termas'?

Thank you for answers

P

Malcolm wrote:

Hls termas still exist and are still transmitted.

heart said:

Who transmit them?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

You would have to go inquire among Drukpa Kagyus.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 8th, 2016 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: Forgiveness

Content:

Malang said:

Easier said than, done, personally ive been trough some very hard to forgive things, i try but i cant genuinely forgive these things, but this does not feel good, but its beyond me, anyone know what i mean?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it means that you still carry anger and resentment. As Chokyi Nyima says, if you cannot forgive, then forget.

Malang said:

Do you mean conciously say ' im not gonna think about it ' ? I feel if you do this , then you have not uprooted the problem ,and the anger is below the surface , how do you for example forget if you are by neccesity forced to deal with daily those who have wronged you?

Malcolm wrote:

You just put it aside and move on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 8th, 2016 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Klesas are Bodhi & dating 18 y/o girls.

Content:

Adamantine said:

I'm assuming this is a relic of Bramhanic ideas of orthodox purity

Astus said:

The whole idea of 'contamination' seems like that. But it is quite possible that there is no actual connection, it's just that every culture has its own set of superstitions and taboos (e.g. in Japan women were not allowed on whole mountains because of fear of contaminating the holy places, like monasteries).

Malcolm wrote:

Hence the subaltern narrative of the charnel ground *ḍākinī* in the higher tantras as the fertile source of the Dharma, rather the sterile and male dominated environs of the monasteries...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 8th, 2016 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Klesas are Bodhi & dating 18 y/o girls.

Content:

Adamantine said:

Is there any reasoning to this, other than superstition? I can relate to the contamination from very negative people because after spending time with certain people or in certain places I have noticed

it's negative impact on my mind and subtle energetics-- just as being with a realized Lama or in a special pilgrimage place can have a powerful positive impact.

But menstruation I'm unclear about.. I suppose it's never been explained to me properly.. And I have no experiential corollary.

Malcolm wrote:

It is sexist bullshit.

Adamantine said:

Well that seems to be the take on it I've gotten from some western female Lamas

I know! But it's pretty ingrained in the dharma culture. I'm assuming this is a relic of Bramhanic

ideas of orthodox purity, despite Vajrayana supposedly blasting those to smithereens.

Malcolm wrote:

To put it bluntly — there are many Tibetan monks alive today who have no idea at all what female anatomy is and how it functions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 8th, 2016 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Shakyas Shri

Content:

gyamtsotrinle said:

Hii,

I would like to know if there is exists incarnation of great master Shakya Shri? And also is there still available some of Shakya Shri 'termas?

Thank you for answers

P

Malcolm wrote:

His termas still exist and are still transmitted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 8th, 2016 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Klesas are Bodhi & dating 18 y/o girls.

Content:

Adamantine said:

Is there any reasoning to this, other than superstition? I can relate to the contamination from very negative people because after spending time with certain people or in certain places I have noticed

it's negative impact on my mind and subtle energetics-- just as being with a realized Lama or in a special pilgrimage place can have a powerful positive impact.

But menstruation I'm unclear about.. I suppose it's never been explained to me properly.. And I have no experiential corollary.

Malcolm wrote:

It is sexist bullshit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 11:36 PM

Title: Re: Klesas are Bodhi & dating 18 y/o girls.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

These are more connected with the Tibetan cultural ideas than the Dharma.

Astus said:

East Asian countries have their own versions of such contaminations (e.g. the <http://www.reed.edu/hellscrolls/scrolls/Aseries/A06/A06e.html>), as probably every culture.

Malcolm wrote:

Or the idea that menstruating women are impure and will for example contaminate and destroy the blessings of articles to be placed in sūpas and statues should the former come in contact with the latter.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Forgiveness

Content:

Malang said:

Easier said than, done, personally ive been trough some very hard to forgive things, i try but i cant genuinely forgive these things, but this does not feel good, but its beyond me, anyone know what i mean?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it means that you still carry anger and resentment. As Chokyi Nyima says, if you cannot forgive, then forget.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: Klesas are Bodhi & dating 18 y/o girls.

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Here, the word is contamination ['grib] rather than obscuration [sgrib].

Astus said:

And what does contamination stand for? The description given sounds like 'ritual impurity', that might be relevant in Tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is connected with having an incorrect partner and a resultant decline in some abilities, for example, clairvoyance.

One can be "contaminated" by any number of things, such as someone else's clothes, an antique that has come into ones possession, and so on. These are more connected with the Tibetan cultural ideas than the Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: What is faith?

Content:

smcj said:

That's why the practices don't work for us.

krodha said:

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?

smcj said:

A conversation I had with a Tibetan retreat master for western retreatants.

Malcolm wrote:

Your Tibetan friend, retreat master or not, has not met all Westerners.

smcj said:

Let us not forget that masters of the past who have expressed opinions on such subjects did so from the standpoint of first having actually done the practice and gained results. This is qualitatively quite a different thing from just reading however many scriptures and voicing one's own prejudices.

Hence my admonition to not take anything said here seriously, and to ask an authentic lineage lama--especially in this specific subject.

Malcolm wrote:

More sour grapes, as usual...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: What is faith?

Content:

smcj said:

In order for the practice to work you need to have faith in the wisdom being. That's assumed to be true by a Tibetan. It is rejected by Westerners. That's why the practices don't work for us.

Malcolm wrote:

Why do you keep saying this? All four of your statements are false.

1) You do not have to have "faith" in the wisdom being. You merely have to understand what it is.

2) Tibetans do not assume a wisdom being has some kind of external existence, or to be any other than the nature of the mind, cast in an embodied symbolic form.

3) Westerners do not reject something accepted by Tibetans.

4) Who says practices are not working for Westerners? You?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: Klesas are Bodhi & dating 18 y/o girls.

Content:

Adamantine said:

from a Tibetan perspective there is also a view that one can take on residual

obscurations (drip) from another, most especially through sexual union.

Astus said:

That very much contradicts the whole meaning of karma. Following that logic, hunger could be lost around well fed people. Afflictions reside in one's own mind, generated and maintained through one's own actions. One may agree with or imitate others' actions, but that's still not the same as obscuration-transmission.

Malcolm wrote:

No, he is not being clear. Here, the word is contamination ['grib] rather than obscuration [sgrib].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 5:48 AM

Title: Re: What is faith?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this really just means a fairly elaborate creation stage with an Atiyoga view.

Or, practicing a sadhana in Ati style we have to consider Anu-ati because though we are resting in Dzogchen view at the end, still we are practicing some sadhana with an aim to get somewhere. We somehow still have the idea that our state needs to be fixed. We have not recognized the nature of our mind and elevated our mind correspondingly. We are still suffering from "the illness of effort", as it is put in Sems sde.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 5:37 AM

Title: Re: What is faith?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Thanks, Malcolm. That was impeccably clear. That was actually what I meant about Mahayoga and I do know the difference from Kriya. I just botched my explanation. When I said that the deity is viewed as separate, I misspoke. I meant that you actually have you create the mandala and it's not primordially present. Of course when the mandala is created, one is a deity within that mandala. Seems to be congruent with what you said about viewing wisdom as something to be attained.

You've probably described all of this on this forum several times before. Thanks for your patience. I'm pretty confident this doesn't actually contradict what my teacher said.

Malcolm wrote:

The view of Mahāyoga is that even though the mandala is primordially present, we need to practice reconstituting it, as it were, building it up and then plugging it in over and over again. In the view of Anuyoga, we don't have to keep plugging the mandala in, we plug it in once, and then just remember it when we want to. If we are practicing a

sadhana Ati yoga style, we don't even bother visualizing anything, we recite the words, knowing that just thinking about the deity is sufficient, there is no need to meditate on it, and then we recite the mantra resting in our natural state, which is all the deity is anyway.

tomamundsen said:

Ah, interesting nuance. I had thought that was the Maha-Ati approach and not pure Mahayoga. If you don't mind, now that you've explained Maha, Anu, and Ati, can you clarify what the Maha-Ati style is? Same as Atiyoga style view, but doing all the visualization like in Mahayoga?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this really just means a fairly elaborate creation stage with an Atiyoga view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: What is faith?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Thanks, Malcolm. That was impeccably clear. That was actually what I meant about Mahayoga and I do know the difference from Kriya. I just botched my explanation. When I said that the deity is viewed as separate, I misspoke. I meant that you actually have to create the mandala and it's not primordially present. Of course when the mandala is created, one is a deity within that mandala. Seems to be congruent with what you said about viewing wisdom as something to be attained.

You've probably described all of this on this forum several times before. Thanks for your patience. I'm pretty confident this doesn't actually contradict what my teacher said.

Malcolm wrote:

The view of Mahāyoga is that even though the mandala is primordially present, we need to practice reconstituting it, as it were, building it up and then plugging it in over and over again. In the view of Anuyoga, we don't have to keep plugging the mandala in, we plug it in once, and then just remember it when we want to. If we are practicing a sadhana Ati yoga style, we don't even bother visualizing anything, we recite the words, knowing that just thinking about the deity is sufficient, there is no need to meditate on it, and then we recite the mantra resting in our natural state, which is all the deity is anyway.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

conebeckham said:

<http://www.elizabethmattisnamgyel.com/tag/shentong/>

Having a direct experience trumps all philosophical constructs.

Malcolm wrote:

Ironically, many gzhan stong commentators state that the difference between so called gzhan stong and rang stong is not the experience of equipoise, which is free from all extremes, but in post-equipoise analytical interpretation. This is one of the many reasons why I think we should basically ditch all these novel Tibetan philosophical trips and get back to the basics, ala Khenpo Shenga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: What is faith?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The view that wisdom being is a real being invoked into you from some other place is a stunningly wrong view which is not even the view of kriya tantra, let alone the view of Mahāyoga. It is a skillful means of Secret Mantra meant to remind you of the innate wisdom which you have always possessed since the beginning.

tomamundsen said:

OK, I wasn't being specific enough. It wasn't taught that there is a being that is "invoked into" oneself in some kind of physical sense. But it was taught that the wisdom being is real, at least as real as we are.

Malcolm wrote:

The wisdom being is real in so far as it is symbol of your own innate wisdom which was awoken through the process of the descent of the blessing in the first part of the empowerment rite.

tomamundsen said:

And that sadhana practice is merging the samaya being and wisdom being.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, you create yourself in the form of deity X, and then you activate your own wisdom by summoning the wisdom being as a symbol of that innate wisdom that was pointed out to you during the empowerment. You are not summing deity X from outside to come into you in real sense.

tomamundsen said:

I don't think that necessarily means "invoked into" like what you're saying here. It would mean that one is training to view themselves as inseparable from the deity. And at some levels of practice, we start out from a view where the deity is separate from us and then transition toward the view of union.

Malcolm wrote:

The view that deity is separate from us is the view of kriya, where we practice with the deity before us and slightly higher than we are. Otherwise, the view of yoga tantra is that when we are finished with our practice, the wisdom being is dismissed since in post-equipose we are engaging in impure activities. In higher tantra, since we are never separate from our innate wisdom, the nature of our minds, we remain in the form of the deity 24/7/365.

tomamundsen said:

From a higher view, there is no separation at all from the beginning and there would effectively be no "merging" at all.

Malcolm wrote:

In the practice of Mahāyoga, there is still a summoning of the wisdom being, because there is still an idea that wisdom, even though it is innate, is something to attain. In Anuyoga there is no summoning of the wisdom being because it is understood that the wisdom being and commitment being have always been inseparable as the basis and are nothing other than the basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 4:43 AM

Title: Re: What is faith?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

Even the summoning of the wisdom being into the commitment being is just a reminder that our real state has always been naturally perfected as a mandala, but there is no actual wisdom being that is summoned.

But my teacher just the other day taught that summoning the wisdom being is literally true. However, I believe that the view he was speaking from at the time was not the Atiyoga view. I think it would be a Mahayoga view. I could be wrong about this part, please correct me if so. Isn't it the case that both views are correct, depending on the capacity of the practitioner?

Malcolm wrote:

The view that wisdom being is a real being invoked into you from some other place is a stunningly wrong view which is not even the view of kriya tantra, let alone the view of Mahāyoga. It is a skillful means of Secret Mantra meant to remind you of the innate wisdom which you have always possessed since the beginning.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 4:37 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

sherabpa said:

I'm saying that your knowledge of zhentong is autodidactic.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, in fact your presumption is as false as your dissembling is outrageous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 4:22 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

gzhan stong is merely concerned with explicating the teachings of the Uttaratantra

sherabpa said:

Something I never claimed. The intensity of your bluster is increasing. Whatever, I know the zhentong I received from my own teachers. I don't need autodidacts to tell me what it is. As Sapan rightly says:

A false nose, a purchased child, a borrowed ornament, wealth gotten through stealing, and knowledge gained without a teacher. Though you have such things, others do not regard these highly.

Malcolm wrote:

Ok, it is really outrageous for you to claim that I "stole" my knowledge. Just who the hell do you think you are?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: What is faith?

Content:

smcj said:

It took me less than 15 seconds to find citations by various masters, like Jigme Lingpa etc. that supports Malcolm's statement. Read the relevant literature (like Malcolm says, sadhana commentaries mention this) and you'll see for yourself.

My recommendation was not to click on an internet page, but to seek out a traditional Tibetan lama and ask him--but making sure to ask the proper question. What you get from a teacher that can look into your eye and what you get from a printed page can be quite different.

tomamundsen said:

Right. I can confirm that just the other day (Monday, the 25th), my teacher explained the wisdom being and samaya being in the same way as you're advocating. I don't think it was meant to be Atiyoga view, maybe it was Mahayoga. Anyway, it was definitely taught that it can be viewed in that way on some level of practice. And commentaries don't really mean anything compared to the guru's pith instructions.

Malcolm wrote:

Your writing here is anything but clear.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

khroda said:

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.

smcj said:

That's why it would be interesting to see why Kongtrul thought differently--if he actually did.

sherabpa said:

Of course he did. I didn't make it up. The texts where he calls Longchenpa a zhentongpa are the ones previously mentioned on this thread - Rays of the Vajra Moon and Uttaratantra commentary.

Calling Longchenpa a zhentongpa would not be controversial at all except that what 'zhentong' nowadays has come to mean is Dolpopa's specific interpretation of the Three Natures theory in accordance with Vasubandhu's Brhattika.

Malcolm wrote:

Ummm, no. That is what gzhan stong has meant all along. I suggest starting with Dolbupa [14th century], moving onto Shakya Chogden [15th century], then onto Taranatha [16th century], then onto Rigzin Tsewang Norbu [18th Century] and then Situ Panchen, and see how your contention stacks up [it doesn't.]

What is novel is your idea that gzhan stong is merely concerned with explicating the teachings of the Uttaratantra, but this perspective is incredibly anachronistic and wrong headed as we can see from the historical progression of the master who gave gzhan stong its foundation [Dolbupa] and the various scholars who followed his lead.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 3:29 AM

Title: Re: What is faith?

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

FWIW, I point out the following passage from "The Crystal and the Way Of Light": There are eight principal classes of Guardians each with many subdivisions. Some are highly realized beings, others not realized at all. Every place - every continent, country, city, mountain, river, lake or forest - has its particular dominant energy, or Guardian, as have every year, hour and even minute: these are not highly evolved energies. The various

teachings all have energies which have special relationships with them: these are more realized Guardians. These energies are iconographically portrayed as they were perceived when they manifested to masters who had contact with them, and their awesome power is represented by their terrifyingly ferocious forms, their many arms and heads, and their ornaments of the charnel ground. As with all the figures in tantric iconography, it is not correct to interpret the figures of the guardians as merely symbolic, as some Western writers have been tempted to do. Though the iconographic forms have been shaped by the perceptions and culture of those who saw the original manifestation and by the development of tradition, actual beings are represented. (underlining added)

Malcolm wrote:

This has nothing to do with yidams.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: What is faith?

Content:

smcj said:

It took me less than 15 seconds to find citations by various masters, like Jigme Lingpa etc. that supports Malcolm's statement. Read the relevant literature (like Malcolm says, sadhana commentaries mention this) and you'll see for yourself.

My recommendation was not to click on an internet page, but to seek out a traditional Tibetan lama and ask him--but making sure to ask the proper question. What you get from a teacher that can look into your eye and what you get from a printed page can be quite different.

Malcolm wrote:

What makes you think our replies come from anyone other than traditionally trained Tibetan Lamas?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: What is faith?

Content:

smcj said:

Since you are the one who is confused, I think you are the one who needs to go and clarify this for yourself.

That sounds like you are worried about what a traditional lama would answer.

Malcolm wrote:

Why should I be? I have read hundreds of commentaries about this very issue. I know what they will say.

smcj said:

In a nutshell the question is: Does the ultimate nature of the deity negate its relative nature, and therefore make faith unnecessary?

Malcolm wrote:

This question is a non-sequitar. First of all, there is no ultimate "deity" — if it has hands, colors, eyes, legs, a torso, etc., it is something relative. If you are referring to the continuum of a bodhisattva like Mañjuśrī, it is not something which exists in one place that can be summoned to another place.

Secondly, Mañjuśrī's continuum cannot displace your own, no matter how hard you try to practice divine pride. But with practice, your continuum can become the same as Mañjuśrī's continuum, and depending on your chosen vehicle, with more or less effort.

And, the higher up you go in the yānas, more and more emphasis is placed on personal experience and direct perception, and increasingly less is placed on testimony and inference.

My personal opinion is that since Ati yoga places the most emphasis on personal experience and direct perception it is the best vehicle for westerners, among all the available Vajrayāna options. But that is just my orientation. Other people like imagining themselves as this and so on

And that is all well and good, very excellent paths, very excellent practices, all practiced with full attention and carefully can result in Buddhahood in a single lifetime, but Dzogchen is still faster and more direct...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: What is faith?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Even the summoning of the wisdom being into the commitment being is just a reminder that our real state has always been naturally perfected as a mandala, but there is no actual wisdom being that is summoned.

smcj said:

IMO, that is precisely the idea that defeats the practice of Westerners.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is a statement that is repeated in hundreds of commentaries on sadhana practice.

smcj said:

I think it is worth encouraging people to go to the effort to ask a traditional Tibetan lama about it. Don't you agree?

Malcolm wrote:

Since you are the one who is confused, I think you are the one who needs to go and clarify this for yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 2:26 AM

Title: Re: What is faith?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahahahha, communing with nonhuman beings is the main point of Vajrayāna practice? What a joke. The main point of Vajrayāna practice is just the same as Mahāyāna practice, attaining buddhahood by eliminating the two obscurations, end of story.

Commune all you like, but if your afflictions and knowledge obscurations are not being reduced, you are wasting your time.

smcj said:

Do you think Manjushri is confused about emptiness? Do you think Chenrezi lacks compassion? If they were to merge with--or even displace your present awareness (as in having "divine pride"), do you think your obscurations would remain untouched?

Malcolm wrote:

Neither Mañjuśrī or Avalokiteśvara are concrete external entities at all in the context in which you mention them.

"Divine pride" is a temporary method belonging to the creation stage, and as such it is a conceptual meditation, prophylactic in nature, meant to replace our ordinary sense of self. But this is not the end of the path, in order to attain buddhahood, we still must depend on the direct perception of the nature of our minds that both Mañjuśrī or Avalokiteśvara symbolize. But there is no external Mañjuśrī or Avalokiteśvara that merges with our minds. To believe there are means that one has utterly missed the point of the teachings completely. Even the summoning of the wisdom being into the commitment being is just a reminder that our real state has always been naturally perfected as a mandala, but there is no actual wisdom being that is summoned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 2:14 AM

Title: Re: What is faith?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps the traditional way of teaching Tibetans is not suitable for Westerners. Have you thought of this?

smcj said:

In the year 2016 my thought is that the modernized way of teaching Westerners is ineffective, thus my pointing out the difference between a Western approach and a Tibetan approach.

Malcolm wrote:

What is the modernized way of teaching westerners, and who is teaching them this "ineffective" Dharma?

smcj said:

Which subject? Communicating with non-human beings being the main point of Vajrayāna practice?

Not "communicating". More like "communing".

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahahahha, communing with nonhuman beings is the main point of Vajrayāna practice? What a joke. The main point of Vajrayāna practice is just the same as Mahāyāna practice, attaining buddhahood by eliminating the two obscurations, end of story.

Commune all you like, but if your afflictions and knowledge obscurations are not being reduced, you are wasting your time.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: What is faith?

Content:

smcj said:

Ray's particular point of view is informed by something of an obsession with shamanism. But Tibetan Buddhism is not shamanism and is not principally concerned with communicating with non-human beings in general. But this seems to have become important to you somehow, an article of faith.

Do you object to the idea that people should go and ask a traditional lama about this subject?

Malcolm wrote:

Which subject? Communicating with non-human beings being the main point of Vajrayāna practice? Perhaps the traditional way of teaching Tibetans is not suitable for Westerners. Have you thought of this?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 1:46 AM

Title: Re: What is faith?

Content:

smcj said:

What is missing here is the understanding that ritual is a way of communicating with beings who, on the relative plane, really are there and really are important to us. This lively and compelling sense of ritual is, at present, sometimes hard to come by in Western adaptations of Tibetan Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the fact is that Vajrayāna rites seem dead to people because they have no understanding of Abhidharma at even a minimal level, and thus do not understand the process of mandala creation as being a means of ritually transforming one's continuum and its aggregates, elements and sense gates into a mandala of awakened beings. The process is entirely symbolic and is not magical or supernatural in anyway at all.

Ray's particular point of view is informed by something of an obsession with shamanism. But Tibetan Buddhism is not shamanism and is not principally concerned with communicating with non-human beings in general. But this seems to have become important to you somehow, an article of faith.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: What is faith?

Content:

smcj said:

So to be clear; when I say that faith is a fundamental element for Vajrayana practice in no sense do I believe that it prohibits the experience of enlightenment. It is a prerequisite for the practices to bear fruit, for us to experience things for ourselves. But we we discount or reject the issue of faith, so to paraphrase Yoda, "That is why we fail."

Malcolm wrote:

First of all, Ray is not an authority I would turn to.

Second, your definition of faith has nothing at all to with Vajrayāna practice. Faith here means simply that one has to be confident in the teacher and their teachings, thats all. It does not mean that one has to believe the sun shines from their keister. It is not a heavy emotional charge.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, January 7th, 2016 at 1:03 AM

Title: Re: What is faith?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Śraddha, which is often translated as faith, is defined in Abhidharma as the mental factor which brings clarity to the mind, and that is it. It is quite a bit different than the

faith being extolled here by smcj.

Śraddha is a path dharma [part of the 37 adjuncts to awakening], one of the five powers and the five strengths — in other words, it is only relevant to our confidence in the path, and it has nothing to do with believing in ghosts, goblins, etc., including any and all supernatural powers of buddhas, bodhisattvas, siddhas, and dakinis. The existence or nonexistence of these phenomena are irrelevant to our progress on the path, and there is no way in which our belief or disbelief in them affects our path at all. The only "supernatural" things we need to accept are rebirth and karma, since without these, the path taught by the Buddha makes no sense at all.

Punya said:

Inspired by another thread, it would be interesting to explore, in a respectful way, what faith means in a general buddhist sense and in the different traditions (leaving aside the specific topic of guru yoga). These dictionary definitions seem like a reasonable starting point:

1. complete trust or confidence in someone or something
2. strong belief in the doctrines of a religion, based on spiritual conviction rather than proof.

It seems like you would need some faith in the beginning as a dharma student or is it just that you just need an open mind and an acceptance that you don't have a complete understanding yet? What does spiritual conviction mean?

And, if you accept the advice of teachers like HH the Dalai Lama about the complexity of karma, and you content yourself with a more basic understanding, is that just accepting it on faith. (There are more than enough threads here on karma so please confine the discussion to the faith aspect).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 6th, 2016 at 9:50 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

None of that is "verifying knowledge". It is invalidating the erroneous beliefs of unawareness.

Malcolm wrote:

So it is a pure non-affirming negation?

smcj said:

Or, if you don't have a problem with faith, you can skip all that and proceed accordingly.

Malcolm wrote:

Faith has always been the problem that humans being face, because faith involves irrational attributions of authority, and once that starts, it plants the seeds of religious wars.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 6th, 2016 at 6:26 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

But the Buddha never wanted anyone to merely have blind faith and leave it at that.

Right. That's why earlier I made the point that in Christianity the objective is faith and in Vajrayana the prerequisite is faith. The Path starts there, but you've got to follow up with practice. That is very different than dismissing faith entirely.

Buddha wanted people to see for themselves.

Yes. However in the Vajrayana, until such time as they can see for themselves they must initially rely on faith. With realization direct knowledge replaces any need for faith.

Someone who has realized the Dharmakaya has no need for faith at all.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not at all true. The Buddha began all his teachings with something that everyone can see without having faith at all. Sarva dukkham, all is suffering.

In Buddhadharma we do not go from lack of knowledge to knowledge, we go from verifiable knowledge to verifiable knowledge.

The message of Dzogchen teachings is that one can have direct knowledge of one's primordial state, aka the basis, long before one can speak of realizing dharmakāya -- this direct knowledge is made into the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 6th, 2016 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

So we agree that there is no ultimate refuge in the material world. And that until we realize the Dharmakaya ourselves we have take it on faith alone.

Right?

Malcolm wrote:

We don't need to fully realize the dharmakāya. We just need to have personal experience of the positive benefits of the Dharma, then we don't need "faith" because we have experience.

In any case, you are asking the wrong question; it is not about the material world, per se. It would seem to be about the conditioned vs. the unconditioned. However, we don't take refuge in space or cessation, so it is not a question of conditioned vs. the unconditioned.

In Dzogchen, for example, one goes for refuge in one's own knowledge, i.e., rang rig la skyab su mchi'o or something to this effect is very common in Anuyoga level sadhanas.

The real refuge is realization. When one begins to experience the positive effects of the Dharma in one's life, then one can have increased confidence in the Buddha's realization, and thus his Dharma. But the Buddha never wanted anyone to merely have blind faith and leave it at that. Buddha wanted people to see for themselves.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 6th, 2016 at 4:11 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

... only the dharmakāya, or realization of a buddha, is a true refuge.

dzogchungpa said:

Is this not a statement of faith?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is perfectly reasonable deduction that can be made on the basis of understanding what the dharmakāya actually, is — one's own mind free from the two obscurations.

You might ask, well aren't you taking it on faith that the mind can be free of the two obscurations? No, because in my own lifetime I have observed a reduction in my obscurations through practicing the Dharma, which has resulted in a clearer appreciation of the things the Buddha has taught. Thus, I have come and seen for myself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 6th, 2016 at 3:56 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

The whole point of the Madhyamaka is to convince us the seen world is unreliable.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean the Buddha's "seen world" is unreliable?

smcj said:

Can you show me a reliable refuge that is visible?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what level of refuge you mean, ultimate or relative?

If the former, no, since only the dharmakāya, or realization of a buddha, is a true refuge. As your favorite book, the Uttaratantra makes clear, neither the Dharma nor the Sangha are true refuges since they are impermanent and conditioned.

If the latter then there are all kinds of things that I can show you that are "true" refuges.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 6th, 2016 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarbha = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

The whole point of the Madhyamaka is to convince us the seen world is unreliable.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean the Buddha's "seen world" is unreliable?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 6th, 2016 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarbha = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

...his practice boiled down to a faith in things unseen.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense. The Sangha is not unseen, the Dharma is not unseen, and as the Buddha said, "Whoever sees the Dharma, sees me."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 6th, 2016 at 1:39 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarbha = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The ... Three Roots are unseen?

dzogchungpa said:

Well, the last 2 are, by me anyway.

Malcolm wrote:

After a number of years trying to have a perfect visualization of his yidam, Mipham when

to see his root guru, Khyentse Wangpo, and explained his difficulties — Khyentse replied that in all of his years of practicing yidams, he never once notice that the nature of his mind had rosy blush colored cheeks, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 6th, 2016 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: The Nature of Obscuration in Dzogchen

Content:

Vasana said:

This is a great thread. Very helpful.

In regards to Dzogchen, where is the best place to start with Mipham?

Malcolm wrote:

There is very little that is published out there.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 6th, 2016 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: The Nature of Obscuration in Dzogchen

Content:

smcj said:

"The Uttaratantra" is full of analogies that use material objects to make its points: clouds covering the sun, gold in ore, a statue wrapped in rags, etc. It's one of the seminal texts for these kinds of ideas.

Malcolm wrote:

But if you take them literally, your view will be no better than the Hindu view of self, which is why they require interpretation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, January 6th, 2016 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Vasana said:

sorry to butt-in and steer off-topic, but;

Even if your main practice and modality is Dharma, i still think there's space for the Christian /Abrahamic pantheon [aswell as 'extraterrestrials'] within Buddhist cosmology. If one can believe in Indra and the possibility of god and deva beings , the idea of Archangels doesn't seem so far-fetched. Sure, they may also be embedded within

samsara to some extent.

I suppose the cosmology of the 6 realms and the various kinds of beings your average practitioner has no perception of, may be one of those 'unseen' aspects that westerners reject in your view smcj?

Malcolm wrote:

SMCJ seems to be arguing for some emotive kind of faith, a bhakti approach, tears streaming, etc. While such descriptions are certainly to be found in every description of Guru Yoga in traditional manuals, reading them over and over again in a hundred manuals, one comes to understand that these are literary themes meant to instill the point that we should feel deep gratitude to our gurus. It certainly does not mean that everytime we think of our teacher we should be overwhelmed with emotions.

To illustrate my point further, most of the Tibetan teachers I have come into contact with deride the faith of simple Tibetans as being grounded in ignorance. They understand that kind of faith will never win with Western Buddhists who have a four hundred year history of the Enlightenment, and who, because of our vastly superior educational opportunities in the West, are never going to believe in Meru Cosmology merely because some teacher insists that we must.

We do not live in a world with a Christian worldview anymore, despite smcj's insistence that all problems Western Buddhists face is our rejection of Christianity [or in my case, an utter lack of interest and connection with it], we live in a world dominated by a scientific worldview, with all of the faults and qualities inherent to it.

Buddha's message is still "come and see for yourself." The further we get away from that message, the further away we get from the Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 5th, 2016 at 11:19 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Virgo said:

Buddhism is not a faith-based religion.

smcj said:

Some forms are, some forms aren't. If it is really a big deal for you, and you can't get over Christianity trauma, then avoid the ones that are.

Malcolm wrote:

There are those of us for whom Christianity is completely irrelevant, such as myself, never baptized, much less raised with any religion at all.

And still you have not defined what you mean by "faith," other than believing in things that are "unseen," which puts you in good company with the UFO conspiracy crowd.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 5th, 2016 at 6:46 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

EXCEPT for the conclusion Westerners come to that we need not believe in things unseen and need not have unconditioned trust.

Malcolm wrote:

Can you find anywhere where the Buddha states we must have unconditioned trust in things unseen?

smcj said:

You mean besides the Pure Land teachings?

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha never says we must have unconditioned trust in Sukhavati, much less anything else. In fact, in quite a large number of places he says exactly the opposite.

smcj said:

In the Vajrayana simply "Taking Refuge" in the 3 Jewels and 3 Roots seems to cover that ground.

Malcolm wrote:

The Three Jewels and Three Roots are unseen?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 5th, 2016 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: dharmapala vs yidam?

Content:

fckw said:

Can anyone knowledgeable explain me what the difference is between a dharmapala and a (don't know how to call it correctly: "full blown") yidam like, let's say, dorje drollo or hevajra? What's the qualitative difference, in other words why is it generally hold that one should not start a practice with the former if not already very advanced with the latter? I know that some dharmapalas are said to be not completely enlightened. With these, I understand that this could be potentially misleading at very subtle levels of mind. And there seem to be very worldly protectors or even demons. Yet other protectors are said to be completely enlightened. So, what would be the qualitative difference then to a yidam?

Malcolm wrote:

A dharmapāla is generally a bodhisattva in a wrathful, and usually non-human form,

who has taken an oath to protect the Dharma.

A yidam on the other hand is a method of practicing the path based on a sambhogakāya manifestation of a buddha.

Some dharmapālas, such as Mahākāla also double as yidams, that is, they can be practiced as both depending on context and need.

Wisdom dharmapālas are considered dharmapālas who are on the pure bodhisattva stages. Worldly dharmapālās are those who are not on the bodhisattva stages at all. The latter are generally powerful beings of the preta class who have been bound to the Dharma as losers in a conflict with a mahāsiddha such as Padmasambhāva. They frequently need to be reminded of their vows.

conebeckham said:

Correct me if I'm wrong...but some Wisdom Dharmapalas are considered completely enlightened, i.e., Buddhas. These are often "reflex" emanations of yidams like Samvara, Kalacakra, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, Mahākala is one such.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 5th, 2016 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Kuntu Zangpo

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Could you please explain the above a little more ?
Have difficulties with the understanding of imputing.

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

Once one does not recognize the display as ones own appearances, then one imputes duality: subject, object, self, other, etc., and dependent origination is set in motion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 5th, 2016 at 2:58 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 said:

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 wrote:

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 said:

Samantabhadra possessed innate ignorance:

Malcolm wrote:

Most people do not realize that Samantabhadra initially possessed the first ignorance. He never possessed the second.

There are two systems: one with three ignorances and one with two. In the first system (Vima Nyinthig, Khandro Nyinthig, etc.), the three ignorances are the ignorance identical with the cause, innate and imputing; in the second system (Gongpa Zangthal, Zhang Zhung Nyen Gyud, etc.) there are only the second two listed above. Samantabhadra never possessed imputing ignorance.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 5th, 2016 at 2:38 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

EXCEPT for the conclusion Westerners come to that we need not believe in things unseen and need not have unconditioned trust.

Malcolm wrote:

Can you find anywhere where the Buddha states we must have unconditioned trust in things unseen?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 5th, 2016 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, Buddha never said, "You must believe what I say without putting it to the

test." Rather he said, "Ehipassiko," i.e., "Come and see for yourself." When one has seen for oneself, what is the role of faith?

Vasana said:

SMCJ , there are different kinds of faith.

"There are different levels of faith. First, "clear faith" refers to the joy and clarity and change in our perceptions that we experience when we hear about the qualities of the Three Jewels and the lives of the Buddha and the great teachers. "Longing faith" is experienced when we think about the latter and are filled with a great desire to know more about their qualities and to acquire these ourselves. "Confident faith" comes through practicing the Dharma, when we acquire complete confidence in the truth of the teachings and the enlightenment of the Buddha. Finally, when faith has become so much a part of ourselves that even if our lives were at risk we could never give it up, it has become "irreversible faith." - Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche from the book "The Excellent Path to Enlightenment: Oral Teachings on the Root Text of Jamyang Khyentse Wangpo

Irreversible faith is more akin to complete confidence free of any doubts as apposed to any kind of blind-faith or unconditioned trust in something one has no personal certainty in.[but holds faith in none-the-less] When faith is irreversible, it's more akin to knowledge.

Devotion for the Guru can also arise in conjunction with confidence in the reasoning ,logic and direct-cognition of the dharma as one knows that the outer-guru is the living link for realizing the ultimate-guru. It can also be a method of practicing or emulating pure-perception which will in turn eventually leads to effortless and actual pure-perception/realization.

At this point it's not really the same as the devotion or 'clear-faith' we find at the beginning of the path before any direct-perception of one's nature has occurred.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 5th, 2016 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

I really do not know what you mean by faith.

Sure you do, but you reject it.

IMO that's the problem.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I actually do not know what you mean by faith.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 5th, 2016 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

I was going through some boxes in the garage and came across my own handwritten notes from a Deshung R. lecture. In my own handwriting I quoted Deshung R. as saying, "The reason we say that the Yidam is the same nature as your mind is because if we didn't the deity could become a demon." By that I assume he meant that having a direct experience of the deity can be so startling that it can precipitate a fear response if it is thought of as something other than one's own nature.

With that type of understanding you can see how saying that a deity is of the same nature as your own mind does not nullify the need for faith while doing deity practice.

Malcolm wrote:

I really do not know what you mean by faith.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 5th, 2016 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Tulshuk Lingpa questions

Content:

Norwegian said:

Nosta,

Tulshuk Lingpa had the stamp of approval by both HH Dudjom Rinpoche, and Chatral Rinpoche. What else do you need when you have this?

As for the image of the footprint, it looks like how footprints in rock tend to look like, comparing it with other known instances of this phenomena. Here's the handprint of Guru Padmasambhava, above the entrance of a cave he did practice in:

http://www.dharma-media.org/media/general/dwnld/photos/drigung/monkey_year_teachings_2004/20040221/DSCF0658.JPG

Malcolm wrote:

I can tell you that Guru P had very small hands...

Adamantine said:

And Milarepa was so small he fit into a yak horn. . . his hands must have been sooo tiny

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think you get my point — I put my hand in that handprint, and my hands were much larger. All I am saying is that Guru P, physically, could not have been taller than 5'

4". He was a tiny guy by modern standards, though not by the standards of his day.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, January 5th, 2016 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: Sutra Sources

Content:

Ray Rudha said:

Don't mind quoting sources.

Not gonna chop it up though.

Malcolm wrote:

Uh huh, so out of your laziness, you are going to make more work for moderators?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 4th, 2016 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: Kuntu Zangpo

Content:

Vasana said:

The confusion is probably because there are two different Samantabhadras spoken of.

One as the Adi-Buddha within Dzogchen, and one as a Bodhisattva.

If the adi-buddha is spoken of as attaining enlightenment, it's probably taken out of context or as an expedient means of communicating some facet of realizing Samantabhadra for one's self.

The kunjed gyalpo tantra is a great resource for understanding Samantabhadra.

Malcolm wrote:

There are actually five "Samantabhadras" spoken of in Dzogchen tantras: Nature Samantabhadra, Ornament Samantabhadra, Teacher Samantabhadra, Vidyā Samantabhadra, and Realization Samantabhadra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 4th, 2016 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: Tulshuk Lingpa questions

Content:

Norwegian said:

Nosta,

Tulshuk Lingpa had the stamp of approval by both HH Dudjom Rinpoche, and Chatral Rinpoche. What else do you need when you have this?

As for the image of the footprint, it looks like how footprints in rock tend to look like, comparing it with other known instances of this phenomena. Here's the handprint of Guru Padmasambhava, above the entrance of a cave he did practice in:
http://www.dharma-media.org/media/general/dwnld/photos/drigung/monkey_year_teachings_2004/20040221/DSCF0658.JPG

Malcolm wrote:
I can tell you that Guru P had very small hands...

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, January 4th, 2016 at 10:43 PM
Title: Re: dharmapala vs yidam?
Content:
fckw said:

Can anyone knowledgeable explain me what the difference is between a dharmapala and a (don't know how to call it correctly: "full blown") yidam like, let's say, dorje drollo or hevajra? What's the qualitative difference, in other words why is it generally hold that one should not start a practice with the former if not already very advanced with the latter? I know that some dharmapalas are said to be not completely enlightened. With these, I understand that this could be potentially misleading at very subtle levels of mind. And there seem to be very worldly protectors or even demons. Yet other protectors are said to be completely enlightened. So, what would be the qualitative difference then to a yidam?

Malcolm wrote:
A dharmapāla is generally a bodhisattva in a wrathful, and usually non-human form, who has taken an oath to protect the Dharma.

A yidam on the other hand is a method of practicing the path based on a sambhogakāya manifestation of a buddha.

Some dharmapālas, such as Mahākāla also double as yidams, that is, they can be practiced as both depending on context and need.

Wisdom dharmapālas are considered dharmapālas who are on the pure bodhisattva stages. Worldly dharmapālās are those who are not on the bodhisattva stages at all. The latter are generally powerful beings of the preta class who have been bound to the Dharma as losers in a conflict with a mahāsiddha such as Padmasambhāva. They frequently need to be reminded of their vows.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, January 4th, 2016 at 7:19 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He doesn't, actually. He stresses "real knowledge of one's primordial state [aka the basis]."

smcj said:

Right. And when that isn't workable, his backup suggestion is to do....what?

Malcolm wrote:

Discover that knowledge for yourself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 4th, 2016 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: Coincidence vs Tendrel

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

Is there any way to determine if there is an auspicious (karmic) connection from past lives, other than "feeling" said connection? Deluded minds can invent all sorts of things, and it's not lost on me that apophenia occurs when we seek patterns/meaning. Recent revelations have come to light that have me thinking about this topic. Any scriptural basis or teachings from great masters that could help sort this out?

Malcolm wrote:

Mo, and perhaps calculation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 4th, 2016 at 3:01 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

Mahamudra and the Great Perfection are realized through direct perception, rather than devotion or the fabrications of the intellect.

-- Namdrol, Heart Treasure of Samantabhadra

I guess that is why ChNN stresses the development of devotion in the Guru Yoga, right?

Malcolm wrote:

He doesn't, actually. He stresses "real knowledge of one's primordial state [aka the basis]."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 4th, 2016 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

Just to be clear, my thesis is as Matt J said: On the other hand, the gzhan stongpas have a good explanation for how Buddhahood is both uncreated and "positive." If I'm understanding correctly, the gzhan stongpas would say that once the obscurations are removed, then the virtues of Buddhahood naturally manifest. So from that POV, compassion is natural while greed, hatred, and delusion are distortions based on ignorance. Once the distorting influences are removed, then compassion and so forth would come forth naturally and effortlessly.

Thus an intellectual understanding of Shentong can give the intellect an opportunity to let go of intellectuality.

Dilgo Khyentse, "The Heart Treasure of the Enlightened Ones" p. 76: The most profound of all teachings, the Mahamudra and the Great Perfection, are realized through devotion rather than through the fabrications of the intellect.

Malcolm wrote:

Mahamudra and the Great Perfection are realized through direct perception, rather than devotion or the fabrications of the intellect.

-- Namdrol, Heart Treasure of Samantabhadra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, January 4th, 2016 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarbha = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

So I believe making an issue out of Shentong is important, not because it is important to have precision or orthodoxy about emptiness in the Vajrayana, but because it is necessary to get past intellectuality and proceed with faith...

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is necessary to get past intellectualism and proceed with direct perception, that is the main point. There are two ways to approach that, the upāyamarga and mokṣamarga, i.e., the paths of method and liberation respectively. The former depends on empowerment, and the two stages; the latter depends in direct introduction — but the main point is illustrated in the following way. In sūtra — and this applies to gzhan stong as much as anything else — the understanding of dharmatā is like a painting of a moon. The understanding of dharmatā in the path of method is like seeing a moon in the water. The understanding of dharmatā in the path of liberation is like looking at the moon directly from the start.

Since gzhan stong is principally a sūtrayāna tenet, it requires a lot more faith. The teaching of sugatagarbha, for example, exists to remove five faults, it does not however mean that faith in sugatagarbha constitutes entering the path.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 3rd, 2016 at 11:45 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The first Tibetan to use the term was Kawa Paltseg, ninth century, and he used it refer to the Madhyamaka that was based on freedom from all extremes. More or less everyone had this usage until Dolbupa gummed up the works in the 14th century with his brand new "Uma chenpo."

Because of the popularity of Trungpa, when he introduced the gzhan stong/rang stong distinction in his seminars, the term "Great Madhyamaka" became associated in western minds with gzhan stong. This was further reinforced by Hookham's book and by the Big Red Book, accompanied by a fairly aggressive campaign to promulgate gzhan stong as an alternative to Gelug Madhyamaka.

smcj said:

So therefore if one is discussing the writings of Kawa Paltseg, one will understand the term "Great Madhyamaka" to mean freedom from extremes. If one is discussing Dolpopa, one will understand "Great Madhyamaka" to mean Shentong, specifically his flavor of Shentong to be exact. If one is discussing Dudjom R.'s writing one will understand "Great Madhyamaka" to mean as per "The Big Red Book", etc.

As long as the context is explained the usage will be clearly understood, right?

Malcolm wrote:

The term is kind of meaningless at this point, since so many people claim it in their writings from so many different schools.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 3rd, 2016 at 11:28 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

And as I have pointed out so many times, every single school of Madhyamaka in Tibet considers their view "Great Madhyamaka."

This, in order to use the term properly, clearly, and without confusion, one must attribute the context of which school and author's usage you are talking about. As such it is 100% valid to use the term when if it is explained to be as used by a major author such as Dudjom R. In his "Big Red Book",

Right?

Malcolm wrote:

The first Tibetan to use the term was Kawa Paltseg, ninth century, and he used it refer to the Madhyamaka that was based on freedom from all extremes. More or less everyone had this usage until Dolbupa gummed up the works in the 14th century with his brand new "Uma chenpo."

Because of the popularity of Trungpa, when he introduced the gzhan stong/rang stong distinction in his seminaries, the term "Great Madhyamaka" became associated in western minds with gzhan stong. This was further reinforced by Hookham's book and by the Big Red Book, accompanied by a fairly aggressive campaign to promulgate gzhan stong as an alternative to Gelug Madhyamaka.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 3rd, 2016 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

I am not arguing that the view of Dzogchen is gzhan-stong, or that there is little difference between them. Rather it seems to me that Dzogchenpas have really little regard for anything like philosophical consistency; they appear to use whatever is available at hand to deliver the One Thing Needful, with worrying about consistency or analytical rigour.

I don't mind in the least, btw.

Malcolm wrote:

You are assuming that Longchenpa's views and Mipham's views are monolithic, cut from the same mold. They aren't. You can't just paste them up side by side without taking into account the vast differences in environment that produced them.

Longchenpa is writing in a fairly polemic free environment, a full 100 years before the major controversies raised by Tsongkhapa and his opponents. He was mainly writing in an environment where Nyingma teachings in general were being somewhat neglected and provided a basis in scholarship for many of the teachings of Dzogchen. That being said, Longchenpa's writings also seem to have been neglected for quite a long while, perhaps because during this period Nyingma was institutionally weak.

Mipham is writing at the end of 400 years of trenchant polemics between Gelugpas and everyone else. The vast majority of his critiques in the Original Mind Trilogy are being leveled at Gelugpas who presume to interpret Dzogchen through the lens of their own educational background. For example, the main recipient of criticism of Mipham is a guy named Jawa Dö ngag, who was a student of Zhabkar and Paltrul, who also had a Gelug background.

The whole of the Original Mind series is a recording of Mipham's oral teachings in

response to that fellow's interpretation of Dzogchen. Indeed, we can see a great deal of similarity between the ideas about Dzogchen that are being rejected by Mipham and some ideas about Dzogchen advanced today by HH Dalai Lama.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 3rd, 2016 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = 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 said:

Gzhan stong is not "Great Madhyamaka", really wish you would listen to what people say and stop referring to it as such.

anjali said:

In the for what it's worth department, calling Great Madhayamaka zhentong (rightly or wrongly) has historical precedent. For example,

Taranatha in The Essence of Zhentong, p. 9 said:

In Tibet, the Great Madhyamaka is the Madhyamaka of discerning cognition and is known as "zhentong."

Malcolm wrote:

And as I have pointed out so many times, every single school of Madhyamaka in Tibet considers their view "Great Madhyamaka."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 3rd, 2016 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Duckworth then provides lots and lots of Longchenpa to substantiate the claim that in Dzogchen potentiality manifests Buddha qualities. One of such snippets is as follows:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the qualities exist as potentials in the basis, but not as fully manifest. The manifestation of the potentiality of the qualities of the basis occurs because of realization. We see Mipham defining the presence of qualities based on a subjective criteria:

While maintaining the position, "This purification of any obscurations is the feature of the time of path. This total purification of obscurations is the feature of the time of the

result,” is in accord with the mode of appearance of sentient beings, from the perspective of the mode of existence of dharmatā, it is not possible to move even slightly away from abiding in state of uniformity which lacks any divisions of dualistic phenomena such as division by three times, division into pure and impure, sentient beings and buddhas, and so on. Therefore, the unfixed mode of appearance (of not realizing the basis just as it) is not defined as if the basis was the time of the sentient beings, and the path was the phase of a bodhisattva. The extremely pure result is the dhātu of the basis that has always been free of obscuration in the sight of the Buddha, because that seer who sees the qualities as having always been perfect is the pristine consciousness that sees ultimate reality in which existence and appearance totally correspond.

From the perspective of seeing that ultimate sight of the ultimate, since this assertion by the treatises of the Great Perfection that all phenomena have always been buddhahood in the essence of the buddhahood of the result is proven with reasoning of ultimate investigation. it cannot be refuted by anyone as not being so. Therefore, since it is similar with the teaching in the Mahāyāna sūtras that the sugatagarbha has always been endowed with the qualities such as the ten powers and so on, it is also definitive in meaning.

He also points out:

Therefore, similarly, since there is no proliferation of any kind in the dharmatā of the mind, the naturally luminous self-originated pristine consciousness, the conventions of dualistic dharmas such as whether that is newly realized or not do not exist. Realization and nonrealization are dualities in the mind. Therefore, that dharmatā of the mind, the object to be realized with the path, is the suchness that has always been present. The realizer of that is the mind (blo), which is the wisdom of hearing, reflection and meditation. That is the mind (yid) at the occasions of the unceasing concepts of hearing and so on. When that mind (yid) is introduced to that dharmatā, the mind itself is also realized in the state of that dharmatā, and there is no difference between the subject and the object. Therefore, though the convention of realization and nonrealization do not exist in the dharmatā of the basis, this convention of realization and nonrealization is to be understood to be from the perspective of the mind of the sentient being that arises from the state of dharmatā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, January 3rd, 2016 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: Casket Seal Dharani Sutra

Content:

conebeckham said:

Sutra Dharanis do not require empowerment, but secret mantra vehicle methods require transmission from a qualified guru to a qualified student. Ray, you're free to believe and practice whatever you want, but to deny this point is contrary to the tradition, and counterproductive for yourself and others.

Malcolm wrote:

You are wasting your breath.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 2nd, 2016 at 11:25 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Not in Dzogchen, Lamdre, etc.

Anders said:

Why not? Wouldn't the alternative be then that you and I should be able to make use of omniscience in this moment?

Malcolm wrote:

The point of view of both Dzogchen and Lamdre is that qualities are present in the basis in the form of a potential, but are not present as fully expressed. The latter is the gzhan stong perspective, which you can read about in Mountain Doctrine and other places.

The difference is pretty well established in this way: in Dzogchen, the qualities are expressed by realizing the nature of the basis. Those qualities do not exist prior to realization.

In gzhan stong, the qualities already exist, and are revealed merely through the removal of afflictions.

In Dzogchen, afflictions become the five wisdoms through the process of realization; in gzhan stong the afflictions are absolutely different than the five wisdoms, the removal of the former reveals the latter.

Moreover, the gzhan stong pas, the basis and result are undifferentiable. Mountain Doctrine, ppg. 89 states, "These say that this which is the body of attributes, matrix-of-one-done-to-bliss, element of attributes, omnipresent in all three states, is the very perfection of wisdom, the undifferentiable entity of the basis and fruit, the buddha lineage, and say that it exists at all times and the basis of all phenomena..."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 2nd, 2016 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: Can I choose an enlightened deity as a protector?

Content:

Ray Rudha said:

Or am I just making that up.

Malcolm wrote:
You are just making it up.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, January 2nd, 2016 at 3:32 AM
Title: Re: Can I choose an enlightened deity as a protector?
Content:

Ray Rudha said:
The first turning deals mostly with establishing the practice and presence of Bodhisattvas, and miraculous compassion.

Malcolm wrote:
No, the first turning concerns the four noble truths, etc., as the Samdhinirmocana Sūtra very clearly states:
At first, since the Bhagavan demonstrated the aspects of the four noble truths to those correctly participating in the vehicle in the deer park called R̥ṣivadanam, the amazing Dharma wheel he turned first was amazing, a corresponding Dharma had not been turned in the past by any deva nor any human. However, that Dharma wheel that the Bhagavan turned was surpassable, contextual, of provisional meaning, and a basis for contention.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, January 2nd, 2016 at 3:07 AM
Title: Re: Can I choose an enlightened deity as a protector?
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
The statement below refers to when a ārya bodhisattva is in equipoise. But only Buddhas are in equipoise 24/7/365.

Ray Rudha said:
The Lankavatara sutra clearly explains that the Bodhisattva is an illusion, only realizing his own illusory nature on the higher Bhumis, and thus realizing the Buddha nature itself.

...

You have no wisdom. None at all.

Malcolm wrote:
Coming from you, this is compliment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 2nd, 2016 at 2:17 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The point is this:

"The fully established true nature (parinirvana), nondual gnosis, the buddha-body of reality, and so forth, are real and existent."

Which means that the ten powers and so on are fully developed within sentient beings at present.

treehuggingoctopus said:

You can say that nondual gnosis and its Buddha qualities are fully developed but not fully manifest (in the sense of not fully cognised by those on the path) yet.

Malcolm wrote:

Not in Dzogchen, Lamdre, etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 2nd, 2016 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: Can I choose an enlightened deity as a protector?

Content:

Ray Rudha said:

Yet you specifically mentioned the Lankavatara, which is higher than all these sutras that the quote is from,

Malcolm wrote:

Says, who? You? You are an authority on Mahāyāna sūtras, capable of telling us which is higher and which is lower? Ridiculous.

Ray Rudha said:

and I showed you all the applicable quotes from the Lankavatara, and they are a much higher level and more powerful discussion of the wisdom play of imageless bliss of Mind.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not address the fact that the Buddha taught in sūtra that buddhahood takes three incalculable eons.

Ray Rudha said:

And I could easily bring Prajnaparamita into the discussion, which doesn't even deal with kalpas, at it is the pure wisdom path.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually it does. For example, the Śatasāhasrika-prajñāpāramitā states:
Those bodhisattva mahāsattva attained actual buddhahood in unsurpassed true perfect awakening after immeasurable countless eons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 2nd, 2016 at 1:50 AM

Title: Re: Can I choose an enlightened deity as a protector?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You need empowerment to enter Vajrayāna. If someone wishes to attain buddhahood in this lifetime, then they need Vajrayāna teachings, end of story.

Unknown said:

And there is the VAJRAVIDARANA SUTRA, which is called a SUTRA, and which states that the Vajravidarana dharani is the root of all tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

The text specifies it is a guhyamantra, this means it requires empowerment because it belongs to the Vajra family and should be kept secret.

Once again, this text, Ārya-mahābala-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra, though titled a "sūtra," clearly indicates it belongs to secret mantra, details the methods of granting the empowerment into the mandala, saying for example, "If one receives the empowerment into this, one will be free from all inauspiciousness, there will be glorious blessings...." and so on.

Thus, even your contention that if some dhāraṇi or mantra comes from sūtra, no empowerment is required is proven false:

Because one receives empowerment into this sūtra, hundreds and thousands of buddhas go there.

Unknown said:

And that's just the short mantra. The Dharanis are infinitely more powerful. But almost nobody around here even realizes that you can practice dharanis internally and gain samadhi with them, they are just like mantra, only longer, more powerful and more difficult.

Malcolm wrote:

The point of Vajrayāna is that its methods are easy and rapid, and for the more intelligent compared to methods in sūtra; but if you wish to adhere to the difficult and slow, that is your choice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 2nd, 2016 at 1:18 AM

Title: Re: Can I choose an enlightened deity as a protector?

Content:

Ray Rudha said:

Where exactly are the three eons mentioned?

Malcolm wrote:

The Ārya-surataparipṛcchā-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra states:

In order for sentient beings to completely ripen into awakening, they must practice for three incalculable eons.

Ray Rudha said:

The play of the Bhūmis is a play of an illusory body, the Bodhisattva, being embraced by the Buddhas in all directions, by Buddha nature, and realizing the imageless nature of Mind. The play itself is imageless and timeless, allegory, where the accumulation of time is an internal process which cannot be said to be an actual thing called time.

Malcolm wrote:

The Ārya-saddharmasmṛtyupasthāna states:

Very briefly, having known the suffering of saṃsāra, once one attains omniscience by through arduous practice on the six perfections for three incalculable eons, there is parinirvāṇa.

Ray Rudha said:

Anyone with true wisdom practice understands this. Also, a Bodhisattva gaining samādhi with a dharani instantly cuts through endless eons, internally and externally.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha states in the Ārya-gośṛṅgavyākaraṇa-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra:

I demonstrated arduous practice for three incalculable eons.

The Buddhābhagavānaṣṭaśata-nāma-dhāraṇī states

Alas, the great qualities of buddhahood

are accumulated for three incalculable eons.

Nāgārjuna write in the Aṣṭamahāsthānacaityastotra:

Having first generated the mind for supreme awakening,

then gathered accumulations for three incalculable eons,

buddhahood was attained on the bodhimaṇḍa, and Māra was tamed,

homage to the Mahābodhi Caitya.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 2nd, 2016 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Trungram Gyaltrul incarnation/lineage?

Content:

Karma Jinpa said:

Does anyone know about Trungram Gyaltrul Rinpoche and his lineage?

Malcolm wrote:

He is on the Shamar side of the things...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, January 2nd, 2016 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: Can I choose an enlightened deity as a protector?

Content:

Ray Rudha said:

Actually in the Lankavatara he teaches non-discrimination attainment of Mind, and how to reach his own stage.

Now, you may believe that takes three incalculable eons, or you may practice mantra and wisdom.

Either way, the Buddha taught the dharani and mantra gate in sutra, and spoke of its incalculable benefits.

Which do not require empowerment.

The empowerment of the 10th Bhumi Bodhisattva is automatic.

In fact, the Treasure Chest Seal sutra, discussed here recently, speaks of receiving the empowerment of all Buddhas through that very dharani.

You are trying to reduce an incredibly complex sutra to a self-serving point that tries to elude the simple matter discussed here.

Sutra mantras do not require empowerment, and somehow people are making it sound different.

It's not.

Malcolm wrote:

The empowerment of tenth stage bodhisattvas occurs at the end of three incalculable eons, dhāraṇis and all.

There is no method taught in any sūtra of going from the stage of a beginner to a fully awakened buddha in a single lifetime. That kind of teaching belongs to Vajrayāna alone. In order to practice Vajrayāna, one must receive empowerment. In order to receive empowerment, one must have a guru. There is no other way.

There is nothing at all wrong with reciting dhāraṇis, but reciting them will not lead a beginner to fully awakening in this life.

Ray Rudha said:

The methods are many.

Malcolm wrote:

None of those methods in sūtra lead to Buddhahood in a single lifetime. There are very many reasons for this, but receiving empowerment is at the root of them all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 1st, 2016 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Matt J said:

I would bet that Dzogchen Ponlop Rinpoche is a gzhan stongpa given that his root teacher is Khenpo Tsultrum Gyamtso Rinpoche and he is a lineage holder in both Dzogchen and Mahamudra, so I'm not convinced that Dzogchen is necessarily inconsistent with gzhan stong in all its formulations.

Malcolm wrote:

In Mantra, it is possible for people have a conceptual sūtrayāna view which is not consistent with how they practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 1st, 2016 at 11:40 PM

Title: Re: Can I choose an enlightened deity as a protector?

Content:

Ray Rudha said:

You do not need anything to practice the mantras of the Great Bodhisattvas, as well as countless Buddha mantras which are available. It is always strange to hear people talking about needing empowerment for mantras found in sutras. If the mantra is in the sutra, that is your empowerment. The sutra itself is the matrix of all Buddhas. What other empowerment?

Just get samadhi with the mantra, that is the ultimate empowerment.

Need extra empowerment? Read a long dharani every day. Far more powerful than a human.

<https://medium.com/@johnutah/vajrapani-98d2fbb7d37c#.qvxyir414>

<https://medium.com/@johnutah/ksitigarbha-majestic-earth-king-of-vajra-freedom-57024e217e97>

Also, Avalokiteshvara, Cundi, the various mantras from the Golden Light sutra, and so on and so forth.

Johnny Dangerous said:

It's really irresponsible to hand out advice like this, you are (ironically) putting yourself in the place of a teacher.

In Vajrayana, many things require empowerment, and your own little theories on the matter are of little import, you're not in any position to be disputing what some people are taught by their teachers, while of course you're welcome to your own practice.

Some traditions of course have practices that require no empowerment, however, I wonder how many would say "sure just get it off the internet and start with no instruction". I'm sure there are a few (maybe pureland works like that?), but i'd imagine that it'd still be recommended to make some kind of connection, and get a walkthrough.

Ray Rudha said:

[Removed post]

Malcolm wrote:

Sūtras do not require empowerment, but becoming a Buddha does. One can either wait for three incalculable eons to attain the tenth bhumi and receive empowerment, as Buddha has taught in the Lankāvatara and other sūtras, or one can find a qualified guru and receive proper empowerment and attain buddhahood in this life as the Buddha has taught in many tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 1st, 2016 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Have you read Stearns' book on Dolpopa, Malcolm? If Stearns is correct (i.e., if his translations of Dolpopa are accurate), then Dolpopa's version of gzhan-stong is indeed quite incompatible with Dzogchen -- but for entirely different reasons than the supposed inherent existence of intrinsic Buddha qualities:

Stearns' Dolpopa, in Buddha from Dolpo, 103 said:

Buddhahood is stated to be the buddha-body of gnosis, and the incidental impurities are stated to be the groups of consciousness. In that way gnosis and consciousness are stated to be extremely different, like light and dark, or nectar and poison. Nevertheless, the differentiation of those two is very rare. These days the majority maintains that this very mind-as-such is the buddha-body of reality, self-arisen gnosis, and the Great Seal, and many maintain that concepts are the buddha-body of reality, the afflicting emotions are gnosis, samsara and nirvana are indivisible, these appearances and sounds are the three buddha-bodies or the four buddha-bodies, and so forth.

treehuggingoctopus said:

Stearns' commentary is as follows:

Stearns, Buddha from Dolpo, 104 said:

For Dolpopa appearances cannot be the manifestation or self-presencing of gnosis (ye shes rang snang), or the buddha-body of reality, because ordinary appearances are completely fictitious, imaginary (parikalpita) and dependent (paratantra) phenomena, which are both actually nonexistent. The fully established true nature (parinispanna), nondual gnosis, the buddha-body of reality, and so forth, are real and existent.

treehuggingoctopus said:

That would indeed make gzhan-stong starkly different from Dzogchen. But the rest of the passage expresses the same understanding that Hookham champions:

Malcolm wrote:

The point is this:

"The fully established true nature (parinispanna), nondual gnosis, the buddha-body of reality, and so forth, are real and existent."

Which means that the ten powers and so on are fully developed within sentient beings at present.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 1st, 2016 at 6:18 AM

Title: Re: Western Tulku and adequate training.

Content:

kirtu said:

Even now we only have few structured Dharma educational activities (not even actual institutions with a couple of exceptions) available. So shedras in some form do have to be build out.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Studying at a Shedra might be a viable career choice for a Tibetan, but not for a westerner, unless it is accompanied by western academic credentials. Even then, the idea that a westerner is going to be able to make one's living as a professional Dharma educator is slim at best.

It is a vocation, and one that generally does not reward well.

kirtu said:

The structure of the traditional shedra has to be modified. There might possibly be some degree of accreditation in a western sense. But the primary thing is that the course of study should be available up to the geshe and equivalent level, esp. for monks and nuns but also for laypeople.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, just keep your day job.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 1st, 2016 at 6:00 AM

Title: Re: Western Tulku and adequate training.

Content:

kirtu said:

Even now we only have few structured Dharma educational activities (not even actual institutions with a couple of exceptions) available. So shedras in some form do have to be build out.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

Studying at a Shedra might be a viable career choice for a Tibetan, but not for a westerner, unless it is accompanied by western academic credentials. Even then, the idea that a westerner is going to be able to make one's living as a professional Dharma educator is slim at best.

It is a vocation, and one that generally does not reward well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 1st, 2016 at 5:57 AM

Title: Re: This is why you need a teacher!

Content:

Ray Rudha said:

The ultimate teacher is mantra.

Malcolm wrote:

No teacher, no mantra. Dhāraṇīs are not mantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 1st, 2016 at 5:38 AM

Title: Re: This is why you need a teacher!

Content:

Ray Rudha said:

Mantra does NOT depend on a teacher. That is an absolute wrong view. Mantra is the essence of Vajra, and the continuity of Buddha, Dharma, Sangha is always just Buddha nature, so to say mantra depends on a human element lacks wisdom.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it does, the necessity of reliance on a teacher is taught in great detail in the tantras of Mantrayāna. It is sheer ignorance to pretend it is otherwise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 1st, 2016 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Not according to Shenpen Hookham...

Malcolm wrote:

According to Dolbupa. And it is for this reason that ChNN has explained many times that gzhan stong view is not actually compatible with Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 1st, 2016 at 1:42 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

incidentally, it may seem like I care deeply about this topic, but I don't. All of this stuff is sūtrayāna. If one is a Vajrayāna practitioner, it does not really matter much what view one holds conceptually, since that is not and never will be the real view. The real view is the view introduced by the guru, either in a formal empowerment or as a intimate instruction, and personally known for oneself.

MiphamFan said:

Malcolm, so how much of all this study is necessary for a practitioner who is not really interested in becoming a teacher?

Malcolm wrote:

Not much.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 1st, 2016 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: Bön as the 5th Tibetan Tradition.

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek DW members and Admin / Mods,

What do you think, is Bön the fifth Tibetan Tradition?

I guess the Administrator of DW, did made a mistake when he did set up the Bön sub forum.

One can see here aboard, that Bön is the fifth Tibetan Tradition, that is a big mistake historical seen.

Bön was and is the first Tibetan tradition before the Indian Buddhism was imported in Tibet.

Maybe it would be great to change the text into: Bön the first Tibetan Tradition or only the name Bön without explanation.

KY

Malcolm wrote:

However, Bon, as an institutional entity, is rather late, with Menri being founded in the 15th century in response to the fact that most Bonpo lineages were in serious danger of being interrupted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 1st, 2016 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Matt J said:

On the other hand, the gzhan stongpas have a good explanation for how Buddhahood is both uncreated and "positive." If I'm understanding correctly, the gzhan stongpas would say that once the obscurations are removed, then the virtues of Buddhahood naturally manifest. So from that POV, compassion is natural while greed, hatred, and delusion are distortions based on ignorance. Once the distorting influences are removed, then compassion and so forth would come forth naturally and effortlessly.

How is this handled from in Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

gzhan stong pas claim that the qualities of the result are fully manifested in sentient beings, from the beginning.

This is how Mipham characterizes it:

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." Nevertheless, from the perspective of the just the time of the original basis, since the conventions of liberation and nonliberation do not exist, while there are no sentient

beings, there are also no buddhas because liberation and delusion are totally impossible [in the basis].

When the appearance of the basis arises from that, there are two paths, liberation and delusion, that are produced from this appearance of the basis. Liberation arises from realizing the basis just as it is. Delusion arises from not realizing the basis. When the appearance of the basis arise, when one arrives at the liberation of the initial state of original purity, since realization is manifest buddhahood, the ten powers are actualized. Therefore, though the qualities of nirvana such as the ten powers and so on that do not exist in the basis exist as a primordial endowment, other than those who have reached the ultimate realization, buddhas, when even the bodhisattvas of the tenth bhumi cannot see the manifestation of all qualities, what need is there to mention ordinary sentient beings [being able to see them]? That being so, the difference between all the qualities of the basis being manifestly apparent or nonapparent is not from perspective of just the basis. [4/a] It is necessary to make a distinction in dependence on the appearances of a buddha, one who realizes the basis just as it is, and a sentient being, the one who does not realize that.

Hence we can see there is truly a great chasm between the view of gzhan stong and the view of Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 1st, 2016 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

In the same way the result is present in the path in all the yanas...

Malcolm wrote:

If the result is already present, there is no need for the path; this is precisely the place where gzhan stong gets into trouble and Dzogchen does not.

smcj said:

A while back you yourself had as your signature something to the effect that "all practices can be done from the Dzogchen perspective". I have simply restated the same in different language.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, all practices can be done from a Dzogchen point of view, but this does not mean that the result is present at the time of the basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, January 1st, 2016 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

In the same way the result is present in the path in all the yanas...

Malcolm wrote:

If the result is already present, there is no need for the path; this is precisely the place where gzhan stong gets into trouble and Dzogchen does not.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 31st, 2015 at 10:33 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

The basis, path and result are not simultaneous in Dzogchen? I thought you said it was not gradual at all.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the basis, path and result are not simultaneous for Dzogchen. If they were, there would be no need for a path. Dzogchen is not gradual in the sense that it is a path where one gathers the two accumulations.

smcj said:

The basis is the basis because of non realization.

Exactly. But regardless of non-realization we are discussing things from the realized perspective (the "one yana perspective").

An enlightened being sees things the way things actually are as well as understanding how their appearances are mistaken by the unaware. That same level of enlightenment that teaches Dzogchen and Mahamudra also teaches all the yanas. There is no difference from the enlightened being's perspective, except for the degree of unawareness of the sentient being(s) in question.

Malcolm wrote:

This is like saying that because there is no difference in the teacher's perspective, there is no difference between kindergarten and a Phd program.

smcj said:

My assertion is that there is no such thing as a causal vehicle.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course there is, just as there is a resultant vehicle [general mantra], and a vehicle beyond causes and results [Dzogchen]

smcj said:

That is simply a presentation for that accommodates the level of unawareness of the practitioner. There is in actuality only one vehicle from the "one yana" perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is what yāna means, conveyance, etc. Thus, when we say there is one vehicle, it means that regardless of whatever path we choose to follow, rapid or slow, the overall goal is the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 31st, 2015 at 10:20 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

And the Dzogchen idea that the basis, path and result are all present simultaneously is also understood to be true for all 9 yanās. There is no such thing as a "causal vehicle". That is upaya for the benefit of the appearance bound.

Malcolm wrote:

This not a Dzogchen idea. The basis is the basis because of non realization.

The cause yāna exists because some people think that one needs to accumulate causes to achieve buddhahood. This is a characteristic assertion of the cause vehicle, for example, the lam rim perspective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 31st, 2015 at 6:24 AM

Title: Re: European Supplier of Vimala?

Content:

philji said:

On the Himalayan remedies website it says to take 1-2 pellets per day.. On the Siddhi energetically bottle it says 2.... Not sure if quality is different. Any advice???

Malcolm wrote:

I also sell Vimala, and will ship to Europe. Standard dosage is 2 pills. Himalayan Remedies sources their herbs from the same supplier I do.

go to <http://www.bhaisajya.guru>

Price to ship to Europe is higher than within the US.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 31st, 2015 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Matt J said:

Which is also how Dolpopa describes his "Great Middle Way".

Malcolm wrote:

...intrinsic awareness and everything that arises within it are free from all extremes

There cannot be something free from extremes.

Dolpopa's great middle way avoids extremes precisely in reverse of the way Tsongkhapa has it. For him freedom from extremes is arrived at in the following way. He tries to avoid eternalism by asserting that relative phenomena are never held to exist more than conventionally, being intrinsically empty; and he tries to avoid nihilism by asserting that ultimate phenomena are held to have always existed, being extrinsically empty.

Here, what Longchenpa is referring to is the standard four fold negation of the extremes found every in sūtra on up to to the Dzogchen tantras, like the Realms and Dimensions of Sound Tantra [sgra thal 'gyur]:

The amazing, miraculous pristine consciousness
did not exist before, does not exist later, has not existed from the start;
is at present beyond all conceptual objects,
having the nature of the emptiness that is free from extremes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 31st, 2015 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Matt J said:

Maybe it's quotes like this:

Dzogpa Chenpo's view is freedom from extremes is similar to Prasangika-Madhyamka's for the most part. [The main difference] is that the important basic view of Madhyamaka is of a spacelike empty aspect, while the principal basic view of [Dzogpa Chenpo] is of primordially pure and naked intrinsic awareness [rig pa] which is ineffable and unceasing. According to Dzogpa Chenpo, intrinsic awareness and everything that arises within it are free from all extremes, like the [nonexistence] of the limits to space. Ch'os dbyings mdzod kyi 'grel ha Lung gi gter mdzod, by Longchen Rabjam, translated by Richard Barron in A Treasure Trove of Scriptural Transmission, page x.

So if I were more Gelug minded (which I'm not), I might say this goes beyond the non-affirming negation of emptiness by positing something, namely rig pa which has the nature of clarity.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not an affirming negation, since Longchenpa states:

...intrinsic awareness and everything that arises within it are free from all extremes

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 30th, 2015 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = 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.

Malcolm wrote:

I am aware of this, and I find no solid backing for Kongtrul's views regarding Longchenpa in particular.

As for Rangjung Dorje, he had an interesting approach to the three natures, but I don't really see how his writings show the same approach to the three natures as Dolbupa's and Tshan Khawoche. He also never uses the term 'gzhan stong' himself. The fact that in a 16th century commentary on the zab mo nang don one can read a defense of the Karmapa III as being a gzhan stong pa merely shows that this appellation is subject to doubt since it is not clear in his own writings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 30th, 2015 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that there is only one vehicle, not many.

smcj said:

That's why I object to yana snobbery. All authentic teachings come from unsurpassed enlightenment, the ultimate perspective. It's not as if the lower yanas were taught from a lower level of realization. And every generation of realized masters, seeing things from that perspective, reaffirms the appropriateness of the entire path with all the yanas. Hence I consider the 4 Thoughts to be not different than Mahamudra. They come from Mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

Each Yāna is a self contained path. The difference is length, not outcome.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 30th, 2015 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In other words, in sūtra, it very much matters whether one's post-equipose view is in line with one's actual view in equipose. In Mantra, it does not matter that much.

Anders said:

What makes the post-equipose view more relevant in sutrayana?

Malcolm wrote:

Because the analytical view is used in meditation. If that analysis is not correct, one's meditation will not be correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 30th, 2015 at 5:00 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

You should read the parable of the burning house in the Lotus Sutra...

I prefer Blofeld's "Bodhisattva of Compassion".

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that there is only one vehicle, not many.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 30th, 2015 at 4:51 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

You guys are a little Dzogchen/Mahamudra fixated. For me as a lower yana practitioner it's a whole lot simpler if I have an "empty-of-other" view. There's something that's a "higher power", to borrow from 12 step terminology.

Malcolm wrote:

You should read the parable of the burning house in the Lotus Sutra...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 30th, 2015 at 4:48 AM

Title: Re: The Nature of Obscuration in Dzogchen

Content:

florin said:

I don't really understand this quote.

I think it needs some work.

Malcolm wrote:

Damn autocorrect....

All Mipham is saying is that there are two perspectives, how things are and how things appear. From the perspective of how things are, "it is necessary to propose that the universe and beings are primordial buddhahood and meditate in that way."

From the point of view of how things appear, the basis, path and result are divided up by wisdom according to their features: the basis concerns proving the validity of buddhahood. This is why, for example, we have the account of Samantabhadra's buddhahood and the account of the delusion of sentient beings. There is also a practice, and also the culmination of the purification of the delusion which gave rise to sentient beings in the first place. Since only deluded people are concerned with liberation, the path of Dzogchen is very much concerned with correcting the delusion that arises from ignorance [ma rig pa] by remaining in the knowledge [rig pa] of how things actually are, i.e. that the universe and beings are primordial buddhahood.

We are not approaching practice from the point of view of accepting something that is not true, i.e., that the universe and beings are impure, etc. But we must acquiesce that this is indeed how things appear to us, and that as long as things appear in this way to us, we are under the influence of the two obscurations, which while temporary and not innate, conceal from us our actual state.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 30th, 2015 at 4:36 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Mother's Lap said:

Alright, cheers for your time Malcolm.

Malcolm wrote:

A snippet of Mipham for you:

Apart from that pristine consciousness of emptiness that is distinguished by great bliss, any other analysis of Madhyamaka is unnecessary because that [pristine consciousness of emptiness that is distinguished by great bliss] is the actual nonconceptual pristine consciousness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 30th, 2015 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, tenets are analyzed in Dzogchen and Mantra in general since these conceptual views prevent people from appreciating and experiencing the real view.

Mother's Lap said:

Therefore shentong and Gelugpa madhyamaka can be called wrong views, but helpful wrong views (for secret mantra practitioners); aka masters do teach it for the benefit of beings and not out of faulty realisation.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I am not so sure they are helpful views at all; many argue that gzhan stong presents a distortion of the Yogacara school, and many argue that Gelug Madhyamaka presents a distortion of the Madhyamaka school. I don't think it is necessary at all to get involved with these Tibetan presentations of sūtrayāna tenets, especially because they involve issues that are never seen in the Indian milieu. It is really sufficient to practice Secret Mantra alone, since in any case its presentation of emptiness is superior to that of sūtra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 30th, 2015 at 4:08 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Mother's Lap said:

Ultimate analysis is irrelevant if shentong and Gelugpa madhyamaka are a-okay to Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

Whether one's view is eternalistic [like the gzhan stong pas, etc.], or annihilationistic [like the Gelugpas, etc.], as long as one is following the methods of Secret Mantra, it does not matter very much. But this does not mean as a consequence that people can feel free to disregard the consequences of conventional analysis, since then it would make no sense for Dzogchen tantras to exhaustively analyze various views for their deficiencies.

In other words, in sūtra, it very much matters whether one's post-equipose view is in line with one's actual view in equipose. In Mantra, it does not matter that much. Nevertheless, tenets are analyzed in Dzogchen and Mantra in general since these conceptual views prevent people from appreciating and experiencing the real view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 30th, 2015 at 4:04 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Mother's Lap said:

Then it is absolutely kosher for Dzogchen masters to speak of Samantabhadra, in the analytical relative of course, as satcitananda.

Malcolm wrote:

No, because analytically, neither the sat, the cit nor the ananda can bear analysis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 30th, 2015 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Mother's Lap said:

Are shentong and Gelugpa madhyamaka cognitive obscurations?

Malcolm wrote:

All analytical views are conceptual, including the view of freedom from extremes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 30th, 2015 at 3:19 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

incidentally, it may seem like I care deeply about this topic, but I don't. All of this stuff is sūtrayāna. If one is a Vajrayāna practitioner, it does not really matter much what view one holds conceptually, since that is not and never will be the real view. The real view is the view introduced by the guru, either in a formal empowerment or as a intimate instruction, and personally known for oneself.

Mother's Lap said:

And apparently this introduced view has an inherent existent quality. Or not.

How come aryas can't get away with it but vidyadharas can?

Malcolm wrote:

No, the view does not have an inherent quality, apart from the fact that it is based on one's own experience, rather than an intellectual analysis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 30th, 2015 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

sherabpa said:

You mean Kunga Drolchok's gzhan stong lta khrid, which outlines Tshan Kawoche's

views on the Three Natures and precisely this objectionable point about their relation to relative and ultimate. There are perhaps differences between Jonang and Kagyu in relation to the emphasis on the Uttaratantra in what Kongtrul calls 'zhentong'. I had forgotten until now that whole discussion about the Three Natures in Stearns' 'The Buddha from Dolpo'.

If anyone has a link to Loppon Malcolm's earlier discussion, I would be grateful. Primarily I just want to read it, I am happy to leave the discussion as it is.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the summary by Jonang Kunga Drolchok, taken from Tsan Khawoche's book.

Also, it is very important to remember that the Palpung version of gzhan stong was drawn from Jonang, via the Kathok master, Rigzin Tsewang, who then conferred the teaching on Situ Panchen, and it is this direct lineage that Kongtrul is heir.

The whole gzhan stong project, beginning with Tshan Khawoche, was to reconcile the teachings of the three own natures with the the two truths of Madhyamaka, with a view towards proving that the former illuminated the latter with respect to the notion that buddha qualities are inherent and not newly developed on the path.

incidentally, it may seem like I care deeply about this topic, but I don't. All of this stuff is sūtrayāna. If one is a Vajrayāna practitioner, it does not really matter much what view one holds conceptually, since that is not and never will be the real view. The real view is the view introduced by the guru, either in a formal empowerment or as a intimate instruction, and personally known for oneself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 30th, 2015 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: The Nature of Obscuration in Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

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 said:

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.

Malcolm wrote:

The so called "primordial state" aka the original basis is called "the basis" because it has not been realized. When that is realized, it is given the name, "the result." "The path" is just the method of realizing that, which in the case of the Great Perfection, is the

intimate instructions of the direct introduction and their application.

Florin's point of view is influenced very much by "sems sde", which is primarily about the basis. Your point of view is more influenced by man ngag sde, which is more concerned with the methods of realizing that basis.

Another useful snippet from Mipham:

According to that principle, though from the perspective of ultimate reality it is necessary to propose that the universe and beings are primordial buddhahood and meditate in that way, from the perspective of the conventions of the mode of appearances, the differentiation by wisdom into three — the basis, the reasoning that buddhahood is valid; the path, the time of practice; and the result, the culmination of purification — are asserted up to the Great Perfection. Also the treatises of the Great Perfection purpose buddhahood once the five paths of trekchö and the four visions of thögal are finished, but in terms of the mode of appearances, they never assert the accomplishment of buddhahood without finishing the path. When these two are differentiated, after the darkness of doubt about the topics that any of the vehicles of the cause and result have difficulty realizing, since there arises the appearance of confidence knowledge that cannot be diverted, this differentiation is very important.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 30th, 2015 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Bugs or People? from War in Buddhism

Content:

boda said:

Don't worry Jundo, I'm just pulling your leg. We all know you could never do anything wrong.

jundo cohen said:

Of course I could and sometimes do. And no none of us can and never shall.

I am surprised that Mahayana folks seem to struggle with that.

Gassho, J

Malcolm wrote:

It is the usual dissonance between the way things appears and the way things are. The former is a result of our karma and afflictions, then latter has nothing to with karma and afflictions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 30th, 2015 at 12:16 AM

Title: Re: The Nature of Obscuration in Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is pretty straightforward according to Mipham:

In the realization of the Great Perfection that the three times are not time, there are no phenomena of the ten directions and three times that are not perfect. Therefore, this is the dharmakāya at the time of the basis, but because the temporary afflictions have not been purified it has not ripened into the nature of the result.

While maintaining the position, “This purification of any obscurations is the feature of the time of path. This total purification of obscurations is the feature of the time of the result,” is in accord with the mode of appearance of sentient beings, from the perspective of the mode of existence of dharmatā, it is not possible to move even slightly away from abiding in state of uniformity which lacks any divisions of dualistic phenomena such as division by three times, division into pure and impure, sentient beings and buddhas, and so on.

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.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 29th, 2015 at 4:01 AM

Title: Re: Bugs or People? from War in Buddhism

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Fortunately, from that other non-perspective perspective, there is not you or I, termites and families, aliens or earthlings (or earth), not life or death, no space or place to fall.

Malcolm wrote:

Got to love the pretty words...

dzogchungpa said:

Malcolm, don't you get it? A Jundoless Jundo can kill all the termiteless termites he wantlessly wants.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, while the Jundoed Jundo can't kill any of the termited termites he wantonly wants. Good thing Jundo is Jundoless, for his families sake. A Jundoed Jundo would only benefit termites.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 29th, 2015 at 3:40 AM

Title: Re: Bugs or People? from War in Buddhism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[

That is not a koan either, that is just prajñāpāramitā rhetoric used to justify one's own

self interest.

jundo cohen said:

I agree with you. I want to kill the termites because I do not want the house falling on my and my family's heads.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't want your house falling on you or your families head either.

jundo cohen said:

Completely selfish on my part, so good that the termites are not allowed to vote on it. Were it not that I live in an earthquake zone (and recognizing too my selfish refusal not to move to an all cement structure), I would be very happy to share the rafters with the termites.

Malcolm wrote:

Unlikely.

jundo cohen said:

When the space aliens come someday, they may exterminate us earthlings in much the same way, as the inconvenience of a less intelligent life form.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps, like in Childhood's End.

jundo cohen said:

Fortunately, from that other non-perspective perspective, there is not you or I, termites and families, aliens or earthlings (or earth), not life or death, no space or place to fall.

Malcolm wrote:

Got to love the pretty words...

The characteristic of conditioned element and ultimate is the characteristic of freedom from being the same or different; whoever conceives them as being the same or different, they have entered in improper view.
-- Samdhinirmocana Sūtra

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 29th, 2015 at 3:22 AM

Title: Re: Bugs or People? from War in Buddhism

Content:

jundo cohen said:

Well, the Koany aspect is that one might also know that there where no termites to kill

from the start, nor separate Jundo to kill them. Nonetheless, we seek to avoid killing.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not a koan either, that is just prajñāpāramitā rhetoric used to justify one's own self interest.

jundo cohen said:

As one drives down the highway leaving roadkill (although we try to avoid that as much as possible), we also know there is no coming or going.

Malcolm wrote:

It is easier to say that when one is doing the driving and the killing...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 29th, 2015 at 1:32 AM

Title: Re: having a drink

Content:

smcj said:

The way I understand how the Pratimoksha Vows define "no drinking alcohol" is "not even as much as a dewdrop on a single blade of grass." If someone takes the vow and breaks it, they break the vow.

Indrajala said:

My point is that you understand them as 'vows' whereas in Chinese, Sanskrit or Tibetan they might be understood differently. Remember that your definitions in English are not necessarily reflective of the meanings in other languages.

Malcolm wrote:

In Tibetan, they are sdom pa, (samvara) i.e., restraints.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 29th, 2015 at 1:25 AM

Title: Re: Bugs or People? from War in Buddhism

Content:

jundo cohen said:

I really feel the weight of having to kill those termites ... but somehow, whenever there is an earthquake and the heavy roof timbers start shaking over my family's heads ... I know it was necessary. That is the Koan.

boda said:

The koan is: if you really cared then why didn't you just move?

Malcolm wrote:

It is no koan; Jundo recognized that his self interest outweighed his interest in termite

wellbeing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 29th, 2015 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Right, but in every single presentation of gzhan stong, the distinguishing explanation is based on a presentation of the three natures basically unique to the gzhan stong school.

sherabpa said:

is demonstrably false, which it is.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not false. For example, Tshan Kawoche's gzhan stong lta khrid in the gdams ngag mdzod is exclusively concerned with a presentation of the three natures.

Since we are repeating ourselves, and since I lost a longer post somehow, I am leaving it here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 28th, 2015 at 5:14 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

it is completely disingenuous for you to claim that his presentation of gzhan stong excludes mention of the three natures.

sherabpa said:

Bluster. What I said was his text 'Rays of the Vajra Moon' excludes mention of the three natures, which is true.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it mentions the imputing nature, as I pointed out to you. Secondly, it does not rate as a major text of the gzhan stong tradition, not by any stretch of the imagination.

sherabpa said:

The fact that he once uses the term kun btags hardly refutes my main point, which is that one of the primary texts of the zhentongpas is the Uttaratantra.

Malcolm wrote:

I never disputed that Uttaratantra was an important text to gzhan stong traditon. What I dispute is your claim that the gshan stong tradition is built upon the Uttaratantra alone.

sherabpa said:

It is a gross simplification to regard zhentong as a kind of monolithic philosophy the essence of which is a divergent interpretation of the three natures.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a far grosser simplification to regard gzhan stong as kind of monolithic philosophy solely concerned with the teachings of the Uttaratantra.

sherabpa said:

Zhentong involves not just the three natures but also the Uttaratantra shastra and all of the five dharmas, and the Tathagatagarbha sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, the major point of deficiency for which gzhan stong is roundly and rightly criticized is its employment of the three natures doctrine which come from three of the five treatises of Maitreya.

sherabpa said:

However, in the lineage histories, preeminence is given to the transmission of Uttaratantrashastra from Maitripa into Tibet via Tsen Khawoche.

Malcolm wrote:

That is perfectly fine, and has nothing to do with the substance of my main point.

sherabpa said:

This explains why Kongtrul is able to say Rangjung Dorje and Longchenpa are zhentongpas, but you have to deny that.

Malcolm wrote:

Longchenpa clearly identifies Prasanga Madhyamaka as the definitive view in several places, not only one, even so far as saying in the lung gyi gter mdzod that it accorded with the view of the Great Perfection — and he was mostly certainly aware of Dolbupa. But according to gzhan stong, Prasanga is so called "rang stong," a deficient view.

sherabpa said:

His is a broad conception of a transmission lineage with a number of family resemblance features.

Malcolm wrote:

He does not overlook the novel gzhan stong presentation of the three natures; he, like all other gzhan stong authors, in fact spends quite a bit of time explicating them. Shakya Chogden, for example, wrote many hundreds of pages on the subject, as did Taranatha, and so on.

sherabpa said:

It is also why, in order to refute it, zhentong has to be narrowed down to one objectionable point concerning the three natures and most of the actual teachings have to be ignored.

Malcolm wrote:

If you are, like Dolbupa, etc., going to claim a) claim that all five treatises of Maitreya are definitive and b) present a version of the doctrines contained in three of those source texts which is at great odds with the very source texts you claim to follow, it is quite likely that you are going to be taken to task for your exegetical excesses. When this is noticed, you cannot fault the person who is noticing this. That would be similar to blaming a reader for a spelling error in your own composition merely because he or she noticed you made a mistake. The main point is that the three own natures are used by gzhan stong to try and prove the ultimate is empty of the relative (a key doctrine of the gzhan stong view) and so on, deforming both Madhyamaka and Yogacara simultaneously.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 28th, 2015 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: War in Buddhism

Content:

boda said:

Ridiculous. We know that just by walking around every day that we kill countless insects. That being the case, our bad karma would continuously increase.

Malcolm wrote:

This is the point of view of the Jains, not the Buddha. They believe that karma is not related to volition. The Buddha however taught that karma is a synonym for volition.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 28th, 2015 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

What Namdrol is laying out is completely bog standard mahayana - I don't know a single school or lineage that doesn't follow this line of reasoning as a matter of course. It's not even a little equivocal.

Lol, I've lost any idea of what it is we are discussing...

Malcolm wrote:

Luminosity vs. clarity at this point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 28th, 2015 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: Do tantras lose their power when they're exposed publicl

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

I looked into this a little, and it appears that the practice of the "stroke of Ashe" is indeed new.

Malcolm wrote:

What's new about it? (Yes, I know what Ashe practice is).

dzogchungpa said:

Well, I actually don't know much about it, so I will defer to your greater knowledge. It's basically like a kind of calligraphy practice, I think. Are there similiar practices in previous termas?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it is borrowed from Zen, hence, it is not new. It is a kind of integration practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 28th, 2015 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

I am really looking forward to reading your translation, Malcolm. The text does seem (to the ignoramus that I am, in any case) very important -- and, if Hopkins had decided to leave some core twilight language terms untranslated, it would be rather clear.

Btw, what does he mean by the 'Buddha body'?

Malcolm wrote:

This is how he is translated kāya [sku].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 27th, 2015 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Except that Mipham, for example, devotes much energy to rejecting the idea that the so called fundamental or original mind [gnyug sems] is momentary. Just saying...

treehuggingoctopus said:
I have just stumbled upon it in Fundamental Mind.

Btw, Hopkins' translation is a bit of a nightmare... made worse by the fact that the glossary is incomplete. Without the Internet such terms as 'body of attributes' or 'mode of subsistence' would be a total enigma...

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, his translation is certainly challenging.

I hope at some point to bring out a new translation of this this text, as well as the second of the trilogy, An Investigation into the Meaning of the Luminous Original Mind, the Differentiation of the Basis, Path and Result of the Great Perfection entitled Illuminating Wisdom.

The first text, which Hopkins translated, is very citation heavy; this text is very argument heavy, with not so many citations. The third text is a dated collection of various comments made over the years by Mipham on the subject, gathered into a single text. It is my hope to comb through that third text and present illuminating passages, perhaps as footnotes, which expand the topics in the first two texts. This is my present side project. I think that the gnyug sems skor gsum, aka the Trilogy on Original Mind, is a very important series of texts. In it, Mipham corrects many misconceptions about Dzogchen. One thing he especially attacks at length is the idea that the so-called "original mind" is a subtle mind, rather than what it actually is, the nature of the mind, whether that mind is subtle or coarse.

BTW, however challenging Hopkin's translations may be, he is to be highly commended for being the first to bring this into English, as well as Mountain Dharma by Dolbupa.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 27th, 2015 at 11:01 PM
Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong
Content:
Matt J said:

Thus, in the Highest Yoga Tantra system of the New Translation Schools, the fundamental mind which serves as the basis of all the phenomena of cyclic existence and nirvana is posited as the ultimate truth or nature of phenomena (dharmata, chos nyid); it is also sometimes called the "clear light" (abhasvara, 'od gsal) and "uncompounded" (asamskṛta, 'dus ma byas). In Nyingma it is called the "mind-vajra"... This is the final root of all minds, forever indestructible, immutable, and of unbreakable continuum like a vajra [or diamond]. Just as the New Translation Schools posit a beginningless and endless fundamental mind, so Nyingma posits a mind-vajra which has no beginning or end and proceeds without interruption through the effect stage of Buddhahood. It is considered "permanent" in the sense of abiding forever and thus is presented as a permanent mind. It is permanent not in the sense of not disintegrating

moment by moment but in the sense that its continuum is not interrupted—this being analogous to the statement in Maitreya's Ornament for Clear Realization that a Buddha's exalted activities are considered permanent in that they are inexhaustible. It is also non-produced in the sense that it is not adventitiously and newly produced by causes and conditions [since its continuum has always existed].

Dalai Lama, trans. by Jeffrey Hopkins, Kindness, Clarity and Insight, p. 239

Malcolm wrote:

Except that Mipham, for example, devotes much energy to rejecting the idea that the so called fundamental or original mind [gnyug sems] is momentary. Just saying...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 27th, 2015 at 1:14 PM

Title: Re: War in Buddhism

Content:

smcj said:

However HHDL remains a pacifist to this day.

.

Malcolm wrote:

He is not a pacifist. He has at times supported military actions against this or that group.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 27th, 2015 at 1:10 PM

Title: Re: Do tantras lose their power when they're exposed publicl

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

In all seriousness, isn't the Shambhala stuff considered to be terma? There must be new material in there.

Malcolm wrote:

Why? What new could there possibly be that is not already included in creation stage and completion stage, etc.?

dzogchungpa said:

I looked into this a little, and it appears that the practice of the "stroke of Ashe" is indeed new.

Malcolm wrote:

What's new about it? (Yes, I know what Ashe practice is).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 27th, 2015 at 6:03 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

So it seems that the Yogacara facet of the Yogacara/Tathagatagarbha synthesis is still prominent in current Karma Kagyu presentation of Shentong.

anjali said:

See Traleg Rinpoche's book, https://www.amazon.com/Influence-Yogacara-Mahamudra-Traleg-Kyabgon-ebook/dp/B00WAK0KT4/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1451166859&sr=8-1&keywords=influence+of+yogacara+on+mahamudra.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahahahaha:

A unique and interesting look at how Yogacara philosophy influenced tantra and mahamudra. Developed by Asanga and Vasubandhu as a reaction to over-theorization, Yogacara emphasizes that everything comes back to one's own practice and to one's own experience.

This is very funny. Yogacara is much more theoretically complicated than Madhyamaka. Just try giving the Madhyāntavibhanga a try, or the Mahayānasamgraha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 27th, 2015 at 5:34 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Not so long ago, my grandmother would kill a chicken for Sunday. I am pretty sure that if everyone in the family would have said to her: we won't eat the chicken, she wouldn't have killed it. Conversely, since no one told her that when it was possible to do it, each of the family member has a moral responsibility in the killing of the chicken. It is not permissible for a follower of the Dharma to take the meat of an animal that has been expressly killed for them.

jerraj said:

My point exactly. To me there is no difference between my grandmother killing a chicken for her Sunday family gathering and the butcher.

Even though the butcher doesn't kill all the animals having specific clients in mind, when one is buying meat it is like taking meat expressly killed for this person. Why so? Because if the butcher doesn't have the specific piece of meat the client is looking for, the client will ask for it, complain about the absence of meat. Therefore, in the very act of buying meat-even already prepared, there is the actualization of an order placed implicitly and that reveals itself in plain words when the client complains in case his favourite piece of meat is lacking in the store. In the economic field, it is duly called 'demand', and there is a reason for that it seems to me.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I understand your point, I just don't agree with it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 27th, 2015 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

Unknown said:

Not so long ago, my grandmother would kill a chicken for Sunday. I am pretty sure that if everyone in the family would have say to her: we won't eat the chicken, she wouldn't have killed it. Conversely, since no one told her that when it was possible to do it, each of the family member has a moral responsibility in the killing of the chicken.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not permissible for a follower of the Dharma to take the meat of an animal that has been expressly killed for them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 27th, 2015 at 4:32 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

sherabpa said:

As for Brunnholz, I'm not sure what the point is, if any, of saying 'zhentong = yogachara + tathagatagarba'. Why not just say its a lineage of the Five Dharmas of Maitreya?

smcj said:

Because that would just be Tathagatagarba doctrine.

Shentong - Yoga Cara = Tathagatagarba.

Malcolm wrote:

No, only one of the five dharmas is on tathāgatagarba doctrine, the Uttaratantra; three are on cittamatra, one is on Prajñāpāramita.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 27th, 2015 at 3:51 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

sherabpa said:

That is definitely what Malcolm is saying. He notes a number of zhentong texts, including Kongtrul's Treasury of Knowledge, which delineate the three natures as a part of zhentong. It is interesting to note these chittamatra doctrines which Kongtrul says are free of the errors of chittamatra.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that the way the gzhan stong pas use the three nature theory is not at all consistent with the way they are used by Maitreyanatha, Asanga, and Vasubandhu, etc. Not only does Tsongkhapa, Gorampa, Rongton and many others note this polemically, but even Khenpo Karl notes:

Though most followers of gzhan stong accept Vasubandhu's Yogācāra texts in general as belonging to the gzhan stong view, in light of his always using model (1), the frequent explanation in gzhan stong texts that model (1) is characteristic for sems tsam, while model (2) represents one of the most crucial features that distinguishes gzhan stong from sems tsam, then appears to be problematic not only with regard to Vasubandhu's works. This equally applies to the texts of Maitreya and Asaṅga (held to be the principal forefathers of gzhan stong) and all other Indian Yogācāras, since they all use model (1). In addition, Tibetan gzhan stong pas differ as to which ones among those Yogācāras they consider to be proponents of gzhan stong and which ones they merely regard as sems tsam pas.

<http://wordpress.tsadra.org/?p=1215>

Kongtrul falls into the same trap as all the other gzhan stong pas who preceded him when he tries to differentiate sems tsam and gzhan stong through the difference in the way they use the three natures.

sherabpa said:

Why deny this.

Malcolm wrote:

Because it is eminently deniable.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 27th, 2015 at 3:31 AM

Title: Re: Lamas and Monks that Drink and Smoke - Is it Normal?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Not trying to equate those with smoking, I've just always found it odd that people make these assumptions about teachers that imply they are beyond cutting loose a little bit, not all Buddhist teachers are renunciates, and not all participation in the world indicates that someone is hooked by desire.

Tsongkhapafan said:

It's true that not all Buddhist Teachers are renunciates, but they must at least be aspiring renunciates because renunciation is the essential meaning of all Buddha's teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 27th, 2015 at 3:30 AM

Title: Re: 70% of American Buddhists believe in God?

Content:

Gyurme Kundrol said:

This should read "70% of American Buddhists don't know what Buddhists believe"...

Malcolm wrote:

It comes from poll's question, "do you believe in God or a universal spirit?"

I think, phrased this way, many people who self-identify as Buddhist would answer yes to the universal spirit part of the question, especially uneducated ethnic Buddhists.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 27th, 2015 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarbha = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The fact that he recounts different transmission lineages, for example, differentiating Ngog's from Zu, does not make his overall presentation gzhan stong, despite his own obvious preferences.

sherabpa said:

You are demonstrably wrong about Kongtrul's treatment of the Uttaratantrashastra not being zhentong. For example, in his text 'The rays of the vajra moon, a guide to the zhentong madhyamaka view', he says:

....

He refers again and again to the Uttaratantra in this text and does not mention the three natures.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, while it is true in this text of instructions on how to meditate gzhan stong view that he takes his primary scheme as the impure, partially pure and impure and the pure, derived from Uttaratantra, it is completely disingenuous for you to claim that his presentation of gzhan stong excludes mention of the three natures. For example, even in this text, he resorts to the use of the term parikalpita, kun btags, on page 599, vol 8 of the Palpung blockprint of the text in question.

More to the point, in his formal presentation of the gzhan stong view in the Treasury of Knowledge, Frameworks of Buddhist Philosophy, ppg. 249-269, he devotes a good two pages to outlining the three natures as a key doctrine in this system, but in fact, the use of the three natures pervades his explanation of the system in the twenty or so pages he devotes to it.

So while it may be the case that in this meditation manual you bring up there is no full explication of the three natures, in fact the three natures are vital feature of gzhan stong theory that cannot be ignored. As I pointed out, this one difference between Longchenpa, who, while a huge fan of the Uttaratantra, happily consigns the three yogacara treatises of Maitreya to Yogacara-cittamatra; and Dolbupa, who believes that all five treatises of Maitreya have the same intention and that they cannot be placed on a scale.

Indeed, this is a key ingredient to understanding gzhan stong thought, for not only are its exponents willing to try and understand all the treatises of Maitreya as definitive in meaning, not only do they interpret the three natures in a way substantially different than Maitreyanatha, Asanga and Vasubandhu, but they also, unfortunately, adhere to a historical interpretation of the three turnings of the wheel that does not even come from India, but rather, Korea [i.e. Won'chuk's Three Volume Commentary on the Saṃdhinirmocana Sūtra], widely popularized by Buton in his history of Dharma.

sherabpa said:

So you should not keep telling yourself and everyone else that zhentong is essentially or primarily about the three natures, notwithstanding a few apposite comments by Rangjung Dorje.

Malcolm wrote:

I think I shall, since it is demonstrable.

sherabpa said:

Essentially your 'zhentong' is a straw man. It was no more refuted by Nagarjuna than the Uttaratantrashastra was refuted by Nagarjuna, since it does not go beyond what was taught by Maitreya.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't have a problem with the Uttaratantra. I accept it as a definitive summary of the Buddha's teaching in sūtra, just as I accept Nāgārjuna's Madhyamaka as the definitive statement of Sūtra Mahāyāna Buddhist view. There is no contradiction between them.

What I can't accept is 1) any hermeneutic based upon the so called three turnings of the wheel interpreted as historical epochs in the life of the Buddha, since this hermeneutic is directly contradicted by Maitreyanatha in the Sutralamkāra 2.1, and thus is a still born hermeneutic; 2) I cannot accept the gzhan stong presentation of the three natures which is demonstrably distorted and incorrect. In other words, I do not accept the basic groundwork upon which the gzhan stong view is erected.

To enlarge on the first point, there is no Indian source, none at all, for any of the various schemes to bracket this or that Mahāyāna sūtra into the second two turnings mentioned in the Saṃdhinirmocana Sūtra. Therefore, to say that the "Yogacara" sūtras belong the third turning, or the "Prajñāpāramita" Sūtras belong to the second, or the "Tathagātagarbha" Sūtras to the third etc., is entirely speculative. All we can say is that

the Agamas belong to the first, and Mahāyāna sūtras belong to the second and third; but of the latter, we have no inkling of what sūtras are to be included in the second and third turnings, since as Maitreyanatha points out in the Sutrālaṃkāra 2.1.a:
Not previously predicted, arising simultaneously...
And that is where we stand.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 27th, 2015 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Luminosity is not equivalent to mere clarity. Luminosity is the ultimate nature of the mind, according to the Perfection of Wisdom tradition, which you accept as definitive.

Tsongkhapa said:

The Perfection of Wisdom Sutra does not say that luminosity is the ultimate nature of mind. The mind being clear light is not dealt with in Buddha's Sutra teachings.

Malcolm wrote:

You are quite wrong. According the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra in 8,000, not only is the nature of the mind luminous [clear light, 'od gsal ba], everything is luminous, from the material aggregate all the way on up to omniscience. Luminosity pervades everything, but the clarity [gsal ba] of the mind does not.

For example, the Play of Noble Mañjuśrī Sūtra states:

Afflictions are temporary, they cannot simultaneous with the realization of emptiness; they cannot simultaneous with the knowledge of the absence of characteristics and the absence of aspiration; they cannot simultaneous with natural luminosity.

Or for example, the Ornamental Illumination of Pristine Consciousness that Enters the Domain of the Noble Buddhas Sūtra states:

Awakening [bodhi] is the natural luminosity of the natural luminosity of the mind. If it is asked why [bodhi] called luminosity, whatever is natural, that is without affliction, equal with space, possessing the nature of space, properly included within space and like space, because it is very luminous by nature.

Here we have a very clear equivalence: bodhi = clear light/luminosity.

Further, the Śūraṅgamasamādhi Sūtra states:

All phenomena nonabiding, because they are naturally isolated. Because they are nonabiding, they are called nonabiding; since all phenomena are naturally luminous, they are not entities.

The Pratyutpanna Sūtra states:

Because all these phenomena are naturally luminous, they are equivalent with nirvana.

The Vajra Essence Dhāraṇī Sūtra states:

Mañjuśrī, the absence of affliction is awakening, natural luminosity is always nonarising.

The Sūtra that Explains The Manifestation Into the Domain the Method of Of the Sphere of Bodhisattvas states

The mind for unsurpassed true perfect awakening is the mind without afflictions because the turmoil of afflictions has been removed; is the mind of luminosity because it is luminous by nature...

The Sūtra of The Definitive Explanation of the Compassion of the Tathāgata states:

Because the mind is naturally luminous, awakening is naturally luminous. If it is asked for what reason it is naturally luminous, what is natural, that without afflictions, equivalent with space, the nature of space, remains equal with space, is even because it is even with space. That nature is very luminous. Since childish ordinary people do not comprehend natural luminosity, they are afflicted by temporary afflictions. The tathāgatas engage sentient beings with compassion, thinking, "They should comprehend natural luminosity."

The Sūtra of the Intimate Instructions of Mahāyana state:

Due to all sentient beings being like illusions and all sentient beings being naturally luminous, because one's mind is the same, comprehend that the minds of all sentient beings are the same.

In fact the tantras use the same terminology as the above to describe natural luminosity.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Even in the Tantras where the ultimate nature of phenomena is asserted as the union of bliss and emptiness a distinction is made between mind and its emptiness - they are not one and the same.

Malcolm wrote:

U huh, so for you, the nature of one thing is inserted into another thing. Like stuffing an olive with pimento. For you, things are not empty, they just have to have emptiness inserted into them.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Mind cannot be emptiness because then there would be no union of the two truths - there would be only one truth.

Malcolm wrote:

If mind is not emptiness, there is no union of the two truths.

Tsongkhapafan said:

The fourth profundity of the aggregate of form is:

Emptiness is not other than form; form also is not other than emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

"Not other than" means "is the same."

Tsongkhapafan said:

In relation to mind we can read this as "Emptiness is not other than mind; mind also is not other than emptiness"

But that does not mean that they are the same thing.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually it does, just as wetness and water are the same thing, heat and fire are the same thing.

Tsongkhapa said:

Mind cannot be emptiness - why not? Because there would be no union of the two truths and mind could not function because emptiness is unconditioned and, as I said, there is no valid cognition of an unconditioned mind.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, you are in trouble then.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 6:48 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is such a thing as unconditioned pristine consciousness or wisdom [jñāna]. You certainly accept, as the Perfection of Wisdom sutra states:

The original nature of the mind is luminosity.

The Nirvana Sūtra states very simply:

Luminosity is pristine consciousness [aka wisdom].

In the Bhavyakīrti's commentary on Aryādeva's Clear Lamp states:

"Freedom from arising and ceasing" is luminosity, because it is unconditioned.

M

Tsongkhapa said:

Let's examine these quotes.

'the original nature of the mind is luminosity' - if luminosity is equivalent to clarity, this statement is true. The original (conventional) nature of mind is luminosity, but this is not its ultimate nature. The luminosity of mind is therefore not unconditioned.

Malcolm wrote:

Luminosity is not equivalent to mere clarity. Luminosity is the ultimate nature of the mind, according to the Perfection of Wisdom tradition, which you accept as definitive.

Tsongkhapa said:

'Luminosity is pristine consciousness' - this statement alone doesn't prove that

consciousness is unconditioned because the meaning of 'pristine' needs to be defined. It could mean conventionally devoid of obstructions which doesn't prove that it's unconditioned. Also, not all statements made in Sutra is definitive, some are interpretative.

Malcolm wrote:

The term is ye shes, you normally would see it translated as "wisdom."

Tsongkhapafan said:

"Freedom from arising and ceasing" is luminosity, because it is unconditioned." - this is not definitive. Bhavyakīrti was a Chittamatrin and the Chittamatrin view is not definitive because it derives from the Third Turning of the Wheel of Dharma which is not definitive. The Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras are definitive.

Malcolm wrote:

No, in fact he was not a Chittamatrin. He was a follower of Candrakīrti, and the text I cited was his sub commentary on Candrakīrti's Explanation of [Aryadeva's] Clear Lamp.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Regardless of what the scriptures say, it's impossible for consciousness to be unconditioned for reasons I have explained. Unconditioned consciousness has never been an object of valid cognition.

Malcolm wrote:

The Samadhirāja states:

The eye, nose and ear are not authorities,
the tongue, body and mind are not authorities,
if these sense organs were authoritative
of what use is the noble path?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 6:25 AM

Title: Re: What is wrong with feminists these days?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Actually Jesse, as Malcolm and I pointed out...a big chunk of your list are actually results of sexism which affect both men and women, so seeing it as some kind of 'contest' where women have 'won' due to some of these things is flawed. Both sexes suffer due to many of the things you mentioned. In my example, the idea that raising children is exclusively women's job contributes to the idea that men being involved with their children is "creepy" or unmanly, which let me tell you is a very pervasive attitude in middle class America. Of course, it isn't even a consideration at all as you go down the rung, since men are often absent or nearly so.

Malcolm wrote:

This is what happens when you a) watch Fox News too much b) read paranoid conservative web sites:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 6:17 AM

Title: Re: What is wrong with feminists these days?

Content:

Jesse said:

I have demonstrated female privilege pretty well.

Malcolm wrote:

I think not.

Jesse said:

No, it points out that when men make similar claims the general opinion is 'men can't be raped, men would just enjoy being raped, you can't rape the willing, women can't rape men'

Malcolm wrote:

When a man is raped, it is usually, though not always by other men. Rape cases against women generally involve statutory rape charges. Not forceful sexual assaults.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 6:13 AM

Title: Re: What is wrong with feminists these days?

Content:

Jesse said:

One right women have is deciding the fate of the child in any relationship. Men have no real input ultimately, it's totally up to the female, and if the relationship ends with the woman giving birth men are always liable to pay child support, even if the guy didn't want to have a child. Basically it's a consequence without being able to change anything, except to not have sex at all. While females ultimately do get to choose.

Malcolm wrote:

This is so far removed from reality, it is not even funny. Women do not have this right — when a couple decides to get a divorce, what happens is that they lose the right to decide for themselves how to treat their children. They give this right to the courts. Now,

it is true, based on a long, sexist precedent that the women's work of raising children is beneath men, and so therefore, custody of children in contentious divorces are often, but not always awarded to mothers. But this state of affairs actually arises from a sexist attitude towards the work of raising children.

Jesse said:

Sexism also ends up working in women's favor occasionally, namely men being polite to women, opening doors for them.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahaha, this is so lame dude. We do not live in a society where men open doors for women anymore.

Jesse said:

They occasionally do get jobs, and college acceptances because institutions need to fill quotas.

Malcolm wrote:

We, in the US, do not have gender quotas for employment, it violates anti-discrimination laws here.

<https://www.littler.com/publication-press/press/gender-diversity-european-quotas-and-us-law>

Jesse said:

Think of the stereotypes men face, they should be strong, unemotional, not cry or whine about circumstances, they shouldn't display feminine traits, boys who like pink or act like girls are most definitely discriminated against.

Malcolm wrote:

Because of male sexist attitudes about women!!! Really, this should be obvious to you.

Jesse said:

Gay white men are still white men, and nobody would argue they face discrimination, and the simple fact they are gay would instantly counteract any benefits from there white maleness.

Malcolm wrote:

Gay men, whether white or not, still experience a great deal of discrimination. And the discrimination they face is a result, principally, of sexist attitudes towards women.

Jesse said:

Mentally ill people are still discriminated against no matter what color, ethnicity or gender they are, and when discrimination occurs Nobody would defend them like people jump to defend feminism or females.

Malcolm wrote:

Mentally ill people are not 51% of the population. That said, discrimination against mentally ill people is a crime and where it happens, it should be remedied.

Jesse said:

The same goes for fat people, people these days think discriminating against fat people is a GOOD thing. After all they are costing us money in healthcare, they don't take care of themselves, there lazy, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote][/quote]

Same as for the above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: What is wrong with feminists these days?

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

I've stayed home with my kids (due mainly to childcare cost) for a number of years while I work on my education/career change. I get a lot of shit from other men (though none will ever say so to my face, only online etc.) about "woman's work" (like caring for your kids is only woman's work), surprisingly though, I also have caught a ton of flack from women/Moms...many of whom seem to believe that a man who likes kids is somehow creepy - this kind of attitude is pervasive enough for me to agree that this is an area where there is definitely some sexism directed towards men. I also agree that the default attitude towards men in the legal system is often problematic.

The difference of course....it is basically *my choice* whether or not to do this, that is not so for women, and the amount to which it ceases to be a choice increases the further you go down the socioeconomic ladder.

Malcolm wrote:

But this is not female privilege, this is an example of male sexism towards women, such that you get criticized for doing "women's work." So you are experiencing sexism from men based on the fact that they devalue their mother's own job. How sick is that?

Moreover, the default attitude towards men in the justice system is based on the high incidence of men in the legal system being there because assault and rape are perpetrated by men on women. That being said, according to the Bureau of Justice itself, between 2006 and 2010 65 percent of all rapes and sexual assaults go unreported. In general, nearly half of all violent crimes in this period went unreported.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 5:49 AM

Title: Re: What is wrong with feminists these days?

Content:

Jesse said:

1. Female privilege is being able to walk down the street at night without people crossing the street because they're automatically afraid of you.

Malcolm wrote:

Really, not being regarded as a threat is a privilege? Since when?

Jesse said:

2. Female privilege is being able to approach someone and ask them out without being labeled "creepy."

Malcolm wrote:

Ummmm, I have been hit on by some creepy women. Nope.

Jesse said:

3. Female privilege is being able to get drunk and have sex without being considered a rapist. Female privilege is being able to engage in the same action as another person but be considered the innocent party by default.

Malcolm wrote:

When someone gets drunk and forces his penis into someone's mouth, rectum, or vagina, this is rightly considered rape, whether the women involved is drunk or not.

Jesse said:

4. Female privilege is being able to turn on the TV and see yourself represented in a positive way. Female privilege is shows like King of Queens and Everybody Loves Raymond where women are portrayed as attractive, competent people while men are shown as ugly, lazy slobs.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you are leaving out a lot of other stereotypes of women. Anyway, nothing you have brought up illustrates female privilege.

Jesse said:

5. Female privilege is the idea that women and children should be the first rescued from any sort of emergency situation. Female privilege is saving yourself before you save others and not being viewed as a monster.

Malcolm wrote:

So now you are including children as part of female privilege? Anyway, this does not fly. The women and children who get rescued first are the women and children of white men, always, in every emergency.

Jesse said:

6. Female privilege is being able to decide not to have a child.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I agree, their body, their privilege.

Jesse said:

7. Female privilege is not having to support a child financially for 18 years when you didn't want to have it in the first place.

Malcolm wrote:

Huh? What do you mean?

Jesse said:

8. Female privilege is never being told to "take it like a man" or "man up."

Malcolm wrote:

Huh?

Jesse said:

9. Female privilege is knowing that people would take it as a gravely serious issue if someone raped you. Female privilege is being able to laugh at a "prison rape" joke.

Malcolm wrote:

I see, so if someone commits a crime against you, and this is taken seriously, this is a "privilege," rather than a right to be free from assault?

Jesse said:

10. Female privilege is being able to divorce your spouse when your marriage is no longer working because you know you will most likely be granted custody of your children.

Malcolm wrote:

You do understand that when men and women divorce, it used to be the case that the standard of living for divorced women with children declines 37% while a man's improved. This has changed in the last decade or so because of improvements in pay equity. These days both men and women can expect a decrease of about 25% in standard of living following a divorce. Some privilege.

Jesse said:

11. Female privilege is being able to call the police in a domestic dispute knowing they will take your side. Female privilege is not having your gender work against where police are involved.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not a privilege, this based on the fact that men beat women and children. It is a preventative measure which prevents a great number of assaults and murders. So, not a

privilege.

Jesse said:

12. Female privilege is being able to be caring or empathetic without people being surprised.

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, you are really reaching on this one.

Jesse said:

13. Female privilege is not having to take your career seriously because you can depend on marrying someone who makes more money than you do. Female privilege is being able to be a “stay at home mom” and not seem like a loser.

Malcolm wrote:

This is so wrong on so many levels. This is not reflected in today's economy on any level.

Jesse said:

14. Female privilege is being able to cry your way out of a speeding ticket.

Malcolm wrote:

Ummm, no, this is a result of male sexism.

Jesse said:

15. Female privilege is being favored by teachers in elementary, middle and high school. Female privilege is graduating high school more often, being accepted to more colleges, and generally being encouraged and supported along the way.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is really nonsense.

Jesse said:

16. Female privilege being able to have an opinion without someone tell you you're just Misogynist .”

Malcolm wrote:

No, they just get, "Why are you being such a bitch?"

Jesse said:

17. Female privilege is being able to talk about sexism without appearing self-serving.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is a result of the fact that there is sexism against women, it is pervasive, and it is damaging to the people who experience it and perpetrate it, both.

Jesse said:

18. Female privilege is arrogantly believing that sexism only applies to women.

Malcolm wrote:

You have yet to demonstrate any so called female privilege at all. A women's right to her own body is a right, not a privilege. Since the legal definition of life begins in the second trimester, in this country women have the right to choose. I support the right to choose, but not abortion itself.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 5:15 AM

Title: Re: What is wrong with feminists these days?

Content:

Jesse said:

I don't know any feminists. The only experience I have with them is online. Like I said if there are more moderate feminists, I have never heard from them. I thought feminism was a good idea until I started reading articles written by them, because they do indeed reek of an anti-men sentiment, entitlement, and pure generalized judging of all 'white men'. Which I find it incredibly stupid.

There was an article not too long ago where a group of feminists wanted their school principle to be fired unless he made a public announcement at his school acknowledging and apologizing for his 'white male privilege', etc.

Malcolm wrote:

But there is such a thing as white male privilege.

Jesse said:

There forums are filled with questions on how to 'educate' men in their lives of how privileged they are etc. If you go and point out the ways in which women are privileged, you'll instantly be cast a misogynist, verbally attacked and usually quickly banned.

Malcolm wrote:

White women are privileged with respect to their race, but not their gender.

Jesse said:

Women also have privileges in society which men do not. I'm sure everyone can think of at least a few.

Malcolm wrote:

For example?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 5:05 AM

Title: Re: What is wrong with feminists these days?

Content:

Jesse said:

There is no such thing as systematic sexism against women...

Malcolm wrote:

There absolutely such systematic sexism against women:

In a different vein, Professor Marsha Freeman notes with regard to the constitution of the United States of America: "The US constitution, 14th Amendment, has been read to prohibit discrimination against women, but the test is not as rigorous as it is with respect to race discrimination-that is, women's protection is to a lesser standard." She later asserts: "The effort to expand the constitutional protection died a generation ago."³⁴⁸ Other shortcomings were identified in the shadow report submitted to the Human Rights Committee prior to its consideration of the second and third reports of the United States of America:

"The Fourteenth Amendment's equal protection provision has not been consistently interpreted as protecting women from sex discrimination, and it has not been interpreted to require strict scrutiny of sex-based classifications. Instead, the standard ranges from requiring a 'rational basis' for sex-based distinctions to requiring an 'exceedingly persuasive' justification. The Fourteenth Amendment has not been] interpreted to apply to sexual orientation or gender identity discrimination. Nor does it protect women from discrimination on the basis of pregnancy or childbirth. Further, the amendment has been interpreted to require a demonstration of discriminatory intent; it is not sufficient that a law or policy has a disproportionate impact on one sex.

http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/laws_that_discriminate_against_women.pdf

This is why we still need an equal rights amendment [ERA].

Jesse said:

There are plenty of women who disagree with feminism.

Malcolm wrote:

Generally conservative, generally white Christian, who have generally thrown in their lot with defense of patriarchy.

Jesse said:

As I recall there were numerous points made, not a single one.

Malcolm wrote:

In general all of the points raised were a result of sexist policies promulgated by men, and not women.

Jesse said:

The only feminism I see anymore is extremist feminism as shown in the first two links in the OP. IF there are more moderate feminists out there it's rare to hear from them, and most feminists would call them 'fake feminists' anyways.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to get out more.

Jesse said:

Men experience similar sexism from society.

Malcolm wrote:

Only as a Fox News anti-feminist talking point. Otherwise, this idea is plain nonsense.

Jesse said:

Yet men are seen to have no right to question feminist principles without being ostracized, judged, and called misogynists. Equality means equal, it doesn't mean women get more rights than men, or women get to do things men can't do.

Malcolm wrote:

Women have same rights as men, but experience discrimination because of their gender. Men do not experience discrimination because of their gender, even though some of them may wish to believe it is so.

Jesse said:

men aren't discriminated against, you are generalizing and discriminating.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote][quote]

Men certainly experience discrimination, but not because of their gender.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 4:24 AM

Title: Re: What is wrong with feminists these days?

Content:

Jesse said:

[

Women point out sexism towards them = hero's, victims, deserve sympathy.

Males point out sexism towards them = Misogynist, racists, deserves condemnation

Any criticism of feminism automatically makes you prejudiced, and racist, and deluded. There's no need to examine facts, or counterarguments because the forgone conclusion is that anyone who challenges feminism is bad and in need of correction.

Malcolm wrote:

Sexism and racism are a function of power differentials. Sexism is not just biases like "A women's place is in the kitchen." That is too simplistic.

Gender disparity includes all kinds of issues, like unrecognized household work, the fact that there are very few women in STEM occupations, which are 90% men; that professions where women dominate are sorely underpaid, and even then, women in these positions make less than their male counterparts.

In order to prove that there is systematic sexism against men in our society, you would have to also demonstrate the power differentials through which such disparities happen. Claiming for example that most military casualties are male, for example, is a clear result of barring women from active combat duty until just a couple of weeks ago.

There is no sexism against white men. There are consequences for white men, such as a diminishing power differential in our society that causes some white men to feel discriminated against, but anyone who thinks that there is sufficient gender parity in this society to make the claim that there is a serious problem of discrimination against men is just laughable, the sort of ignorant silliness one sees on Fox and Friends.

And yes, there is a connection between racism and sexism, both are a result of patriarchy, so indeed sexism and racism do go hand in hand.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 4:07 AM

Title: Re: What is wrong with feminists these days?

Content:

Taco_Rice said:

I commented on the past lives of Feminists and stated that these ideologues exploit four things in men to maintain their political power:

Malcolm wrote:

hahahahahahaha. Political power?

Congress is only 20% women, in other words, there are only 2 women for every 8 men in the House and the Senate, yet they are the majority population in the US. So please...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I think the entire usage of the three own natures is entirely problematical, and even

though they interpret it differently than Maitreya, Asanga and Vasubandhu, it still causes their doctrine to be involved in internal contradictions. Longchenpa avoids these problems by adhering both to Prasanga Madhyamaka as the definitive view and the Tathāgatagarbha sūtras the definitive sūtras.

sherabpa said:

I accept this, but I do not take the incorporation of the 3 natures as the sine qua non of zhentong. It is a transmission lineage focussing on certain sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

You can call it that if you want, I call it a distorted presentation of the three natures theory.

The other problem I have with gzhan stong is their overly dogmatic adherence to a historical scheme of the three turnings, a scheme which is not derived from Indian Buddhism at all, but rather from Wonho's vast commentary on the Samdhinirmocana Sūtra. There is absolutely no evidence that the tathāgatagarbha sūtras should be considered part of that turning at all. The only people who make this claim are Tibetans. I have done a lot of research in the canon on three turnings, and the way it is used by Buton on down basically is without any Indian precedent.

Very interesting! But if we agree the BN sutras are definitive, it is a moot point.

It is not a moot point at all, since it is the way these sūtras are interpreted defines whether they are definitive or provisional.

Kongtrul's commentary is basically just a rewrite of Rongton Sheja Kunrig's, and cannot be considered a gzhan stong presentation, despite Shenphan Hookham's best attempt to force it into one.

Except for his direct quoting of Mikyo Dorje's Zhentong text, and Dolpopa, and the first Karma Thinleypa, as well as his detailed lineage history in the introduction, i.e the transmission from Maitripa to Zu and Tsen, which he explicitly calls zhentong.

The fact that he recounts different transmission lineages, for example, differentiating Ngog's from Zu, does not make his over all presentation gzhan stong, despite his own obvious preferences. Likewise, Dolbupa's commentary on the Uttaratantra is pretty disappointing if you are looking for some defining gzhan stong feature in it, which it utterly lacks.

The rangtong-zhentong dichotomy was invented by gzhan stong pas themselves, decades before Tsongkhapa wrote a single word. Rang stong is straw man invented by the gzhan stong pas. Nobody accepts that the distinction actually exists apart from gzhan stong pas.

The distinction between affirming and non-affirming negation obviously exists, only the terminology is in dispute. If you think it is not useful at the present time, that is another matter. My (Kagyu) teachers think it is useful.

[/quote]

These negations are not necessarily understood the same way by everyone. But it has become fashionable to assume that the Gelug definition of a non-affirming negation is

the one that is universally meant. For example, Rongzom clearly defines the affirming negation as a proof of your own position, whereas a non-affirming negation is the rejection of another's position. So for him, the Madhyamaka only uses the non-affirming negation, they do not use an affirming negation at all since they have no position to prove, viz existence or nonexistence. {He criticizes Madhyamaka however, also, for other reasons}.

Basically both rang stong and gzhan stong are easily refuted just by looking at the MMK. The refutation of rang stong is:

If there were something subtle that was not empty there would be something subtle to be empty;

but as there is nothing not empty, where is there something to be empty?

The refutation of gzhan stong is:

Since arising, abiding and ceasing are not established, the conditioned is not established,

if the conditioned is not established, how can the unconditioned be established?

There is no object of refutation not included in these two stanzas of the MMK, and they are unassailable. Simply put, gzhan stong is a view more crude than real Madhyamaka. It can be a stepping stone to a more subtle view, but it is not itself that subtle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 3:47 AM

Title: Re: What is wrong with feminists these days?

Content:

Jesse said:

5 Feminist Myths That Will Not Die

<http://time.com/3222543/5-feminist-myths-that-will-not-die/>

Malcolm wrote:

Written by a conservative shill.

Jesse said:

No, Women Don't Make Less Money Than Men

<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/02/01/no-women-don-t-make-less-money-than-men.html>

Malcolm wrote:

Written by the same conservative shill

Jesse said:

5 Ways Society Discriminates Against Men

<http://thoughtcatalog.com/janet-bloomfield/2014/08/5-ways-society-discriminates-against-men/>

Malcolm wrote:

And for this one, well:

Bloomfield, A Voice for Men's "Director of Social Media," was recently booted from Twitter (again) for "targeted abuse" — evidently her harassment of feminist writer Jessica Valenti, which included making up inflammatory fake quotations and attributing them to her.

<http://www.wehuntedthemammoth.com/2015/01/01/janet-judgybitch-bloomfield-tries-to-lie-her-way-out-of-a-twitter-suspension-heres-proof-of-her-targeted-abuse/>

Jesse said:

<http://www.realsexism.com/>

Malcolm wrote:

None of these statistics are a result of sexism of women towards men. All of these stats are a result sexism of men towards women.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 3:35 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Right, but in every single presentation of gzhan stong, the distinguishing explanation is based on a presentation of the three natures basically unique to the gzhan stong school.

sherabpa said:

Not so, e.g. Kongtrul's commentary on the Uttaratantrashastra.

Malcolm wrote:

Kongtrul's commentary is basically just a rewrite of Rongton Sheja Kunrig's, and cannot be considered a gzhan stong presentation, despite Shenphan Hookham's best attempt to force it into one.

There is no reason to consider oneself a gzhan stong pa, even if one accepts the Tathāgatagarbha sūtras definitive.

sherabpa said:

Except that our lineage masters styled it this way.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean Kagyus?

sherabpa said:

You have pointed out that, apart from the 3 natures, there is nothing very distinctive about this view. This is correct. However, place that view in the context of hundreds of years of the Ganden non-affirming negation hegemony, and the rangtong-zhentong

dichotomy and vocabulary starts to look quite appealing.

Malcolm wrote:

The rangtong-zhentong dichotomy was invented by gzhan stong pas themselves, decades before Tsongkhapa wrote a single word. Rang stong is straw man invented by the gzhan stong pas. Nobody accepts that the distinction actually exists apart from gzhan stong pas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 3:28 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarbha = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is really, really accurate. For example, Longchenpa regards the ten tathāgatagarbha sūtras as definitive, but nowhere in his explanation of tathāgatagarbha does he resort to the use of the three own natures to explain tathāgatagarbha theory with respect to the two truths.

sherabpa said:

Is this an aspect of Zhentong you have a problem with? I can think of only a couple of times where the three natures are mentioned in Zhentong texts, i.e. Rangjung Dorje mentions them in the Zabmo Nangdon and the Nyingpo Tenpa. As I recall you don't accept Rangjung Dorje as a Zhentongpa anyway, so is there a problem?

Malcolm wrote:

I think the entire usage of the three own natures is entirely problematical, and even though they interpret it differently than Maitreya, Asanga and Vasubandhu, it still causes their doctrine to be involved in internal contradictions. Longchenpa avoids these problems by adhering both to Prasanga Madhyamaka as the definitive view and the Tathāgatagarbha sūtras the definitive sūtras.

I would not really consider Rangjung Dorje a gzhan stong pa. But he was one of the first Tibetans to use the three own natures novel ways in his texts.

The other problem I have with gzhan stong is their overly dogmatic adherence to a historical scheme of the three turnings, a scheme which is not derived from Indian Buddhism at all, but rather from Wonho's vast commentary on the Samdhinirmocana Sūtra. There is absolutely no evidence that the tathāgatagarbha sūtras should be considered part of that turning at all. The only people who make this claim are Tibetans. I have done a lot of research in the canon on three turnings, and the way it is used by Buton on down basically is without any Indian precedent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarbha = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

So it seems to me that as of this posting the Tathagatagarbha should be considered a "view" in its own right. I personally am not so attached to the 3 natures paradigm for instance.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, but in every single presentation of gzhan stong, the distinguishing explanation is based on a presentation of the three natures basically unique to the gzhan stong school.

There is no reason to consider oneself a gzhan stong pa, even if one accepts the Tathāgatagarbha sūtras definitive.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 3:08 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarbha = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

Brunnholz does include how things developed historically to support his thesis, including what he calls Indian writers who were precursors to the later Tibetan writers. His view seems credible to me. However I've not heard a detailed presentation to the contrary.

sherabpa said:

Jamgon Kongtrul gives a lineage in his introduction to the Uttaratantrashastra. I'm sure Brunnholz is quite correct in his tracing of the lineage. I'm just stressing for Zhentongpas the origins are the sutras on the Buddha nature, as well as Maitreya's 5 shastras, especially the Uttaratantrashastra. So to say it is a combination of yogacara - which normally means the teachings of Asanga and Vasubhandu - and tathagatagarbha, is not really accurate.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is really, really accurate. For example, Longchenpa regards the ten tathāgatagarbha sūtras as definitive, but nowhere in his explanation of tathāgatagarbha does he resort to the use of the three own natures to explain tathāgatagarbha theory with respect to the two truths.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 3:03 AM

Title: Re: Lamas and Monks that Drink and Smoke - Is it Normal?

Content:

Ayu said:

The worst thing about tobacco smoking is its addictive power.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the worst thing about tobacco is that it takes up the radioactive isotope Polonium 210, which is why habitual smoking of tobacco causes lung cancer.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 2:59 AM

Title: Re: What is wrong with feminists these days?

Content:

Jesse said:

All men are violent, anti-feminist, misogynists, racists, rapists, etc.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not all, just the ones that are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: What is wrong with feminists these days?

Content:

Jesse said:

Sorry, you're full of it, and so are these women. Women are pretty damned equal.

Malcolm wrote:

Educate yourself:

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/ariel-smilowitz/for-us-women-inequality-takes-many-forms_b_7064348.html

Jesse said:

Common complaints are 'white male privilege' don't make me laugh. As if every single white male is somehow automatically treated better than women. In fact women have it much easier than men in many areas. Women in general are treated better than men.

Malcolm wrote:

Seriously, what planet do you live on? Generally speaking, white men have it easy in this country. I am one.

Jesse said:

Men who feel the need to defend the honor of uptight, spoiled egocentric women need to have their heads examined, honesty.

Malcolm wrote:

This a pretty sexist remark, which itself is telling. I don't need to defend the "honor" of any women, as if somehow we are discussing someone's chastity which needs

defending. No, I am pointing out the bare fact that women have not achieved parity in our society, not by a long shot.

Jesse said:

I'm not threatened by feminism. Hypocrisy, idiocy and entitlement piss me off. I have no problem pointing it out.

Malcolm wrote:

I suppose you are against affirmative action as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: What is wrong with feminists these days?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Male victimhood....yawn.

Jesse said:

Same thing I think every-time I read feminist rants.

Malcolm wrote:

The reality is that women do deal with discrimination all the time. They make 30 percent less than men in the same exact jobs, on average; they are discriminated against still in so many areas of society. Anyone who does not think we do not live in a patriarchal society where women are severely disadvantaged at every turn needs to wake up.

Those men who find themselves threatened by feminism need to have their heads examined.

Jesse said:

It's all nothing but hypocrisy.

Malcolm wrote:

This kind of totalizing dismissal is exactly the problem women face everyday.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 26th, 2015 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Medicine Buddha Sutra in Tibetan

Content:

kirtu said:

I did have links to the ACIP material but either their server is down or they reorganized the links (I'll check later today).

ACIP is in the process of moving their Tibetan texts to the Red Hat Cloud. And they are unavailable during this process.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

They are all here:

<http://tibetan.works/etext/>

And the Tengyur interface is here:

<http://www.aciparchive.org/ace/#col%28tendg%29>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 25th, 2015 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: 70% of American Buddhists believe in God?

Content:

Adamantine said:

Merry Christmas everyone, it's a wonderful day to celebrate the precious human rebirth of Jesus / Isaa, since it seems quite likely he was a Buddhist yogi and his references to God had the same connotations as the American Buddhists here :

http://www.thezensite.com/non_Zen/Was_Jesus_Buddhist.html

Malcolm wrote:

Very unlikely he was a Buddhist of any stripe at all, and there is absolutely no credible evidence for any of the Jesus in Indian legends. Jeez, you are starting to sound like Michael Roach.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 25th, 2015 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: What is wrong with feminists these days?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Male victimhood....yawn.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 25th, 2015 at 11:07 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Mother's Lap said:

AFAIK

Yogacara:

Imputed Nature - False

Dependent Nature - True

Perfected Nature - True

Shentong:

Imputed Nature - False

Dependent Nature - False

Perfected Nature - True

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 25th, 2015 at 11:07 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarbha = Shentong

Content:

sherabpa said:

Also, if you are bothered by the fact that Maitreya doesn't mention 3 natures of 8 consciousnesses in the Uttaratantrashastra, consider equally why these are mentioned by Buddha in the Sandhinirmochana or Lankavatara sutra but not in the sutras of the second turning. The 84,000 teachings of Buddha are given for different capacities and inclinations, it is that simple.

Malcolm wrote:

Maitreyanatha mentions both in the Sūtrālaṃkāra, which is his grand synthesis of the three main strands of Mahāyāna sūtra: Prajñāpāramita, Yogacara and Tathāgatagarbha. Uttaratantra is solely focused on explicating tathāgatagarbha sūtras; the two vibhaṅgas are focused on Yogacara, and the Abhisamayālaṃkāra is focused on explicating the Prajñāpāramita sūtras. It is that simple.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 25th, 2015 at 11:03 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarbha = Shentong

Content:

sherabpa said:

Shentong has some of the same sources as yogacara and the tathagatagarbha 'doctrine'. This does not mean Shentong is a combination of yogacara and tathagatagarbha.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually it is.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 25th, 2015 at 3:55 AM

Title: Re: Lamas and Monks that Drink and Smoke - Is it Normal?

Content:

Nosta said:

Is it acceptable for a Lama or a Monk to get drunk?

Malcolm wrote:

It is never acceptable to get drunk such that one loses mindfulnesses. That being said, most of the Lamas I have known over the years have been lay people, and most of them drink moderately.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 25th, 2015 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

Buddha's mind is the Dharmakaya. If the Dharmakaya is unconditioned, Buddha is inert, and his merit is therefore inert, but he produces emanations?

Malcolm wrote:

You are making a false equivalency, i.e., unconditioned = insentience. What is the basis for such a claim?

Tsongkhapa said:

There's no such thing as an unconditioned mind...

Malcolm wrote:

There is such a thing as unconditioned pristine consciousness or wisdom [jñāna]. You certainly accept, as the Perfection of Wisdom sutra states:

The original nature of the mind is luminosity.

The Nirvana Sūtra states very simply:

Luminosity is pristine consciousness [aka wisdom].

In the Bhavyakīrti's commentary on Aryādeva's Clear Lamp states:

"Freedom from arising and ceasing" is luminosity, because it is unconditioned.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 24th, 2015 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Buddha's mind is the Dharmakaya. If the Dharmakaya is unconditioned, Buddha is inert, and his merit is therefore inert, but he produces emanations?

Malcolm wrote:

You are making a false equivalency, i.e., unconditioned = insentience. What is the basis for such a claim?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 24th, 2015 at 6:19 AM

Title: Re: Yale Students sign petition to repeal 1st amendment

Content:

Tenso said:

Very disgusting to see what academia has become. Nothing but left leaning brain washing institutions run by washed up hippies from the 60s.

Malcolm wrote:

You really are out of it. Universities in the US have swerved right since the late 70's. This idea that American universities are filled with hippy professors is complete and total nonsense.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 24th, 2015 at 6:15 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Right, but in sūtrayāna, they maintain that it is the merely the absence of inherent existence of things, a natural purity, for example, the way Gyaltsab Je describes it in his commentary in the Uttaratantra.

cloudburst said:

Gyaltsab Je indicates that it has three characteristics, pure, clear and luminous.

The Seventh Dalai Lama says that tathagatagarba is the union of clarity and emptiness.

Even Sakyas like Deshung Rinpoche and Khyentse Wangchuck say that the tathagatagarbha is clear light, conditioned and conventional.

All phenomena have two natures.

Malcolm wrote:

The Sakya position, at least as outlined by Gorampa, is that neither clarity nor emptiness can be considered suitable basis for tathāgatagarbha, i.e. a suitable basis

for liberation. It can't be clarity, because in the Sakya system, clarity is considered conditioned; it can't be emptiness, because that would be the same as an arhat's cessation. The union of clarity and emptiness can be considered tathāgatagarbha because that union itself is unconditioned. But Gorampa would never admit that tathāgatagarbha is conditioned. To claim so is to contradict the Buddha directly. Why? For the simple reason that the tagāthagarbha is a just a name for dharmakāya encased in afflictions; but that dharmakāya is always unconditioned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 24th, 2015 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: Do tantrtras lose their power when they're exposed publicl

Content:

MiphamFan said:

I thought you said there was some new stuff in the Khandro Nyingthig?

Malcolm wrote:

There appears to be some instructions in the KN which are shared with the Five Stages of Ghantapāda. Other than that, nothing "new."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 24th, 2015 at 5:51 AM

Title: Re: Do tantrtras lose their power when they're exposed publicl

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

In all seriousness, isn't the Shambhala stuff considered to be terma? There must be new material in there.

Malcolm wrote:

Why? What new could there possibly be that is not already included in creation stage and completion stage, etc.?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 24th, 2015 at 5:49 AM

Title: Re: Do tantrtras lose their power when they're exposed publicl

Content:

cloudburst said:

Am I not remembering correctly that last year around this time you lamented that the blessings of the Guhyagharba were lost due to the publication of some new translation?

Malcolm wrote:

Not me.

cloudburst said:

To clarify, you think it is ok for someone who has not received, let's say a particular transmission and empowerment, to read a sealed text? For example, if someone had received Guhyasamaja empowerment in sarma, could they read a restricted commentary on the khandro nyingthig, without fearing adverse consequences?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not my job to decide what is ok and what is not ok for individuals. If they were to follow my example, they would seriously try and get the transmission for whatever interested them. On the other hand, do I think that some dharmapāla is going to split open the head of someone who reads it, no.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 24th, 2015 at 2:09 AM

Title: Re: Do tantras lose their power when they're exposed publicl

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is no doubt termas are important, but not because of the information contained in the texts. They are important because of the shortness of the lineage. Such revelations actually contain nothing new or different than what has come before and is older.

dzogchungpa said:

I'm curious, would you be able to hazard a guess as to the last time new information was actually revealed, if ever?

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, 11th-12th century or so.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 24th, 2015 at 12:56 AM

Title: Re: Do tantras lose their power when they're exposed publicl

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Problems in a lineage come when a) the guru is not a qualified one, b) students fight with each other.

Mother's Lap said:

Say Tertön A passes down his terma down through to the seventh generation lineage holder. All these lineage holders were perfect in practice and commitments, and only they gave empowerments out to various disciples. All the 'branch' disciples were bad apples without exception. Does the terma continue to have blessings considering it has a 'white trunk' but the branches are all rotten, if that makes sense?

Malcolm wrote:

I have no idea and don't want to speculate.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 24th, 2015 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Do tantras lose their power when they're exposed publicl

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There are no secrets anymore.

kirtu said:

Sure there are.

Malcolm wrote:

No, there really aren't, not of any substance. Some apotropaic practices may be secret, but they hardly represent the main point of the teachings.

Things have changed. In 1990, many things were secret. Now everything has been published.

kirtu said:

However, pertaining to the original question, in the mid-late 1000's, Sherab Tsultrim started* the Sakya lineage over exactly this issue. Prior to this period the Khön family had been Nyingma. But after some tantric practices were demonstrated publicly as if they were an athletic contest, he said that the blessings had left and told his younger brother, Khön Konchok Gyalpo, to study the Sarma tantras.

Malcolm wrote:

Specifically it was Mamo dances performed at a harvest festival. Nevertheless, to this day the main practice of the Khon remains Nyingma. The reason for this is that once Khon Khonchog Gyalpo buried all these Nyingma teachings in a stupa, he had a dream where the protectors told him to remove Kilaya and Yangdag from concealment and to maintain the practice in the Khon family in perpetuity. The main eight deity Sakya protectors also come from terma lineages, as witnessed by their inclusion in the Rinchen Terzö. \

So are we going to maintain that all of these formerly secret practices that have now been published, such as Mahamudra, Lamdre, Dzogchen, Kalacakra, Lama Chopa, etc., are all finished because their details can be found in any major library? I think not. The teachings of the Dharma do not not become ineffective because they are disseminated. They become ineffective, if, like medicine, they are not taken.

In any case, what causes problems in the lineage is not publishing books, that is the

least of it. Problems in a lineage come when a) the guru is not a qualified one, b) students fight with each other.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 24th, 2015 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: Do tantras lose their power when they're exposed publicl

Content:

tingdzin said:

This may also be the reason that, as Dudjom Rinpoche said, these days Nyingmapa practice is especially dependent on the tertons, as tertons go to the source as it were, and get a fresh start. Frequently termas are referred to as "still having the warm breath of the dakinis attached to them".

Malcolm wrote:

There is no doubt termas are important, but not because of the information contained in the texts. They are important because of the shortness of the lineage. Such revelations actually contain nothing new or different than what has come before and is older. And we should keep in mind what Nyangral Nyima Ozer writes in his catalogue for the Dharma of the Great Ḍākinī [Mkha 'gro chen mo'i chos]:

In the future, there will be very many Treasure Dharmas with little blessing.

tingdzin said:

And yes, there are still some secrets. I have a friend who has been trying for years to get certain transmissions, but even the most generous lamas refuse to give them.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not mean the contents of those teachings are actually "secret" in the sense that the information in them is not contained in a hundred different texts. It just means that the lamas in question value the integrity of the lineage to a certain degree and wish to give it only to a few disciples. An example of this is the Sde gsum teachings of the Choling Tersar. Lineage is regarded as more important than the actual information in the body of the teachings, upadeshas are favored over tantras, etc.

tingdzin said:

Probably at least in part because they know that these teachings would show up on the internet within a month if they gave them to a Westerner...

Malcolm wrote:

Rather than getting down on westerners, we should remember that it is Tibetans who have published all these "secret" teachings openly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 23rd, 2015 at 6:10 AM

Title: Re: At what age is it appropriate to discuss Emptiness/No-Se

Content:

Techno Yogi said:

This article discusses emptiness from a Madhamikya perspective, and uses a concrete example (growing carrots) to explain it:

If phenomena don't independently exist than how do they exist? The Middle Way tells us that they dependently exist in three fundamental ways. First, phenomena exist dependent upon causes and conditions. For example, carrots depend upon soil, sunlight, moisture, freedom from rodents, and so forth. Second, phenomena depend upon the whole and its parts. Carrots depend upon its greens, stem, root hairs, and so on and the totality of all these parts. Third, and most profoundly, phenomena depend upon mental imputation, attribution, or designation. From the rich panoply of experience, I collect the sense qualities, personal associations, and psychological reactions to carrots together, and name them or designate them as "carrot." The mind's proper functioning is to construct its world, the only world we can know. The error enters because along with naming comes the false attribution of inherent existence, that foundation for desire and aversion.

For the Middle Way, dependent arising is a complementary way of describing emptiness. We can understand them as two different views of the same truth. Therefore, contrary to our untutored beliefs, the ultimate nature of phenomena is its dependency and relatedness, not isolated existence and independence.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a completely incorrect explanation of the Madhyamaka. There is no such thing as "dependent existence" in Madhyamaka teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 23rd, 2015 at 5:02 AM

Title: Re: Yale Students sign petition to repeal 1st amendment

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Part of the problem is that no one can write today, 20 years ago my writing skills were c+, these days they earn me automatic A's.

Malcolm wrote:

No one has been able to write since the 1970's. For example, the first thing I did when I went to school [Harvard Extension] was take a mandatory year of grammar and focused on writing intensive courses. I literally could not write effectively until then.

The problem does not begin in high school, it begins in grade 1.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 23rd, 2015 at 3:11 AM

Title: Re: Yale Students sign petition to repeal 1st amendment

Content:

Paul said:

Time for a moratorium on non-STEM courses in western universities. Give it ten years and then we can start up the liberal arts courses again, hopefully without all the Marxist nonsense that's embedded itself in academia for decades.

Malcolm wrote:

Ahh....the right wing myth of Marxism dominating Academia. That has not been true in the US Academy for at least thirty years.

Paul said:

Well that's me convinced.

Malcolm wrote:

Be informed:

Although we would not contest the claim that professors are one of the most liberal occupational groups in American society, or that the professoriate is a Democratic stronghold, we have shown that there is a sizable, and often ignored, center/center-left contingent within the faculty; that on several important attitude domains – and in terms of overall political orientation – moderatism appears to be on the upswing; that, according to several measures, it is liberal arts colleges, and not elite, PhD granting institutions that house the most liberal faculty; and that there is much disagreement among professors about the role that politics should play in teaching and research.

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.147.6141&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 23rd, 2015 at 2:51 AM

Title: Re: Yale Students sign petition to repeal 1st amendment

Content:

Paul said:

Time for a moratorium on non-STEM courses in western universities. Give it ten years and then we can start up the liberal arts courses again, hopefully without all the Marxist nonsense that's embedded itself in academia for decades.

Malcolm wrote:

Ahh....the right wing myth of Marxism dominating Academia. That has not been true in the US Academy for at least thirty years.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 23rd, 2015 at 2:49 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't. Dharmakāya is realized for one's own benefit. The two rūpakāyas are realized for the benefit of others.

Tenso said:

Sambhogakaya is also for one's own personal benefit, no? If not then why is it called the body of bliss/enjoyment?

Malcolm wrote:

It is realized for the benefit of ārya trainees on the eighth bhumi and beyond. Sambhoga means "enjoying together." Enjoying what? The Mahāyāna Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 23rd, 2015 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Yale Students sign petition to repeal 1st amendment

Content:

Jesse said:

This has to be about the stupidest thing I've ever seen. Yale students are totally for repealing the first amendment in order to 'create a safespace' where no one's feelings get hurt. What the hell is wrong with kids these days?

```
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]
```

Malcolm wrote:

You do realize that Ami Horowitz is a right wing satirist?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 23rd, 2015 at 1:44 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

There are two parts to the Dharmakaya - the Wisdom Truth Body and the Nature Body, which correspond to the functioning omniscient mind of Buddha and the emptiness of that mind respectively. The Nature Body is unconditioned because it's an ultimate truth and the ultimate true cessation.

Malcolm wrote:

This is according to the interpretation of Haribhadra. This is not actually found in the sūtras, per se.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Can you please explain to me how an unconditioned Dharmakaya functions to benefit sentient beings?

Malcolm wrote:

It doesn't. Dharmakāya is realized for one's own benefit. The two rūpakāyas are realized for the benefit of others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 23rd, 2015 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: Do tantras lose their power when they're exposed publicl

Content:

pemachophel said:

In any case, I live in a place where there is a very large Tibetan Buddhist community and has been for 40 years. Sorry to say, I don't get much of a sense of accomplishment from many really long-time practitioners.

Malcolm wrote:

Unless one is clairvoyant, one's sense of the progress of other practitioners is bound to be sheathed in misconceptions. Anyway, all that really matters is that one wakes up in the bardo of dharmatā. Exhibiting signs of realization in this life is just not that important. And if one has received proper instruction in Dzogchen teachings, waking up in the bardo is a certainty, not a guess or an aspiration.

Happy Solstice!!!

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 23rd, 2015 at 1:33 AM

Title: Re: Do tantras lose their power when they're exposed publicl

Content:

pemachophel said:

The way many Tibetan Lamas teach Vajra Armor, They make it sound (at least to me) that one can expect results in a single retreat.

Malcolm wrote:

The original text revealed by Dorje Lingpa specifies a short retreat of a few days. I know many practitioners who have undertaken the Dorje Gotrab retreat and experienced positive benefits from using this mantra, myself included. It is a Dzogchen related practice, so there is no particular visualization and so on that one needs to do.

There are also later revelations of Dorje Gotrab that are more related to Anuyoga, with visualizations and so on. But the root text is strictly a Dzogchen practice.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 22nd, 2015 at 10:50 PM

Title: Re: Deleting of Samayas

Content:

kalden yungdrung said:

Tashi delek DW members,

Maybe a strange thing, but how can we delete some taken Tantric Samayas ?

We all know how to maintain Samayas and how to restore these commitments, but how to delete them to the roots, that is to me not so known.

KY

Malcolm wrote:

If you break your root samayas, you delete them from the root. But this is really hard to do.

Basically, there only real samaya is being committed to liberation, one's own and all others. If you abandon this commitment, you abandon the rest. If you keep this commitment, you keep the rest.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 22nd, 2015 at 10:47 PM

Title: Re: Do tantras lose their power when they're exposed publicl

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This might be an issue with some of the more ritually oriented tantras, but not Dzogchen tantras, in general. After all, what harm can one inflict with the nature of the mind?

tingdzin said:

Well, we are talking about tantras in general here.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, and I addressed these concerns as well. There is also other factors — why, for

example, do we need to keep information like the function of the five or ten vāyus, channels and cakras secret, when they are basically open for discussion in Yoga and so on, as well as Ayurveda and Tibetan medicine? It does not make any sense at all.

The fact is the cat is out of the bag (was it ever in?). Yidams are on tshirts. Mantras are on bumperstickers. Many of the major tantras are in English translation, available on Amazon. If you want to go have a dip in Tantric Exoticism, just go to the Rubin in NYC, buy a glass of bubbly, and wander the exhibits where the transgressive art of Genesis Bryer P-Orridge rubs shoulders with ancient masterpieces of Tibet.

There are no secrets anymore.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 22nd, 2015 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For example, The Ārya-dharmasaṃgīti-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra states:

The real is the dharmakāya of the Tathāgata; the unconditioned is the parinirvana...

The Avatamska Sūtra states:

The dharmakāya is the kāya that never comes nor goes, it is the indestructible kāya because it is unconditioned.

Abhakaragupta states in his Moonrays commentary on Perfection of Wisdom in 18,000 lines:

The dharmakāya is the unconditioned ultimate of the bhagavans.

Or Jñānacandra's commentary on Nāgārjuna's Praise to the Three Kāyas states:

The dharmakāya is exclusively permanent by nature, and because of that, it is therefore unconditioned.

Advayavajra writes in his Five Natures:

The unconditioned mind is dharmakāya,
permanence is the characteristics of the sambhogakāya,
diversity itself is the nirmanakāya,
the original state is the nature of everything.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 22nd, 2015 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

A conditioned dharmakāya is extremely unacceptable in Mahāyāna. It also directly contradicts all of the Buddha's teachings, more tomorrow.

Nope. It's according to the Second Turning of the Wheel of Dharma and Buddha's Tantric teachings which are definitive.

Malcolm wrote:

Citation please?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 22nd, 2015 at 8:48 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarbha = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Right, but in sūtrayāna, they maintain that it is the merely the absence of inherent existence of things, a natural purity, for example, the way Gyaltsab Je describes it in his commentary in the Uttaratantra.

There are also problems with Vajrayāna definition given by the Gelugpas, since this subtle mind is conditioned, whereas tathāgatagarbha is clearly unconditioned.

Tsongkhapafan said:

No, in Sutrayana, Buddha nature is compassion. Emptiness, lack of inherent existence, cannot be Buddha nature because it's not a mind.

Buddha nature, according to you,

Malcolm wrote:

according to the Buddha.

Tsongkhapafan said:

...is unconditioned but this is impossible.

Malcolm wrote:

Not the first time you have been at odds with the Buddha's actual teaching.

Tsongkhapafan said:

It's impossible because permanent things cannot produce effects so if Buddhanature were unconditioned it would be impossible to go from being a sentient being to a Buddha and it would be impossible for a Buddha to benefit any living being, which would negate the whole point of attaining enlightenment.

Malcolm wrote:

You have no idea how incoherent this argument, and the mass of ignorance upon which it is founded. But I am watching TV tonight, so I will have to correct you tomorrow.

Tsongkhapafan said:

The very subtle mind is conditioned and this is the point - once purified of obstructions it transforms into the Wisdom Truth Body of a Buddha and is thereby able to benefit each and every living being without exception. An unconditioned Buddhanature is inert

and pointless.

Malcolm wrote:

A conditioned dharmakāya is extremely unacceptable in Mahāyāna. It also directly contradicts all of the Buddha's teachings, more tomorrow.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 22nd, 2015 at 7:14 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarbha = Shentong

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The only people who maintain this point of view are the Gelugpas, no one else.

Tsongkhapa said:

It's not true that Gelugpas maintain that Buddhature is sheer emptiness. I think Brunnholzl is incorrect: 'sheer natural purity' is a bit vague and also inaccurate. Gelugpas maintain that Buddhature is the very subtle mind of clear light and its mounted wind; this is according to Highest Yoga Tantra.

Malcolm wrote:

Right, but in sūtrayāna, they maintain that it is the merely the absence of inherent existence of things, a natural purity, for example, the way Gyaltshab Je describes it in his commentary in the Uttaratantra.

There are also problems with Vajrayāna definition given by the Gelugpas, since this subtle mind is conditioned, whereas tathāgatagarbha is clearly unconditioned.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 22nd, 2015 at 2:01 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarbha = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

Brunnholzl has a short synopsis of that too. He quotes Sakya Chogden. (p.79)

II. Asserting that sentient beings do not possess buddha nature. (Sakya Pandita, Buton, and others)

Malcolm wrote:

Sakya Chogden is wrong w/regards to Sapan.

smcj said:

In sum, though there are numerous specific differences between the views of all these Tibetan masters, they can be said to fall into two camps--those who assert the tathagata heart as sheer emptiness (be it as the dharmadhatu, the nature of phenomena, or a non implicative negation) and those who regard it as the union of mind's emptiness and luminosity (which includes the buddha qualities).

Malcolm wrote:

Sapan actually adheres to the latter position, i.e. that tathagatagarbha is the union of union of mind's emptiness and clarity. This is the general Sakyapa position.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 22nd, 2015 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: Do tantras lose their power when they're exposed publicl

Content:

muni said:

When available for worldly pursuit, yes. Then they are toy of samsara.

Malcolm wrote:

This might be an issue with some of the more ritually oriented tantras, but not Dzogchen tantras, in general. After all, what harm can one inflict with the nature of the mind?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 21st, 2015 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: Do tantras lose their power when they're exposed publicl

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, they certainly lose their mystery. But this is not a bad thing.

One, we have to recall that these texts were never secret from an elite set of people in India and Tibet.

Second, we have to realize that tantras as texts are artifacts, books written down by human beings, with all the limitations that entails.

Third, masters such as HHDL has said that tantric secrecy can actually be harmful to the teachings in the present epoch, because secrecy inspires fear.

Fourth, texts like Dzogchen tantras are very tame in comparison with some of more "anti-nomian" Indian tantras. The former have virtually no erotic imagery, virtually no descriptions of rites of magic and sorcery, unlike say Hevajra or Kalacakra, or even Guhyasamaja and many of the lower tantras. If Dzogchen tantras were kept secret, it is because they present a narrative of liberation and buddhahood that is not consistent with the gradualist Buddhism that became the state religion of Tibet.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, December 21st, 2015 at 2:17 AM
Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarbha = Shentong
Content:

smcj said:

In any event, further discussion of Longchenpa in the Nyingma or Dzogchen forums should be able to accept the Tathagatagarbha as definitive, minus the synthesis with Yogacara.

Malcolm wrote:

Everybody, Sakya, Kagyu, Nyingma and Jonang, accept tathagatagarbha as definitive. How it is understood in these schools may differ considerably.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, December 21st, 2015 at 1:42 AM
Title: Re: False/Wrong View in Dzogchen
Content:

AilurusFulgens said:

The reason why I have been opening a new topic is, because of a recent exchange I had with an acquaintance of mine, who is an Advaitin and at the same time practices Dzogchen.

I have a very odd feeling with the whole arrangement; especially with his argumentation that lines between Buddhism and Hinduism are not so clear-cut as it may appear and that Buddhism anyway adopted many texts and teachings from Hinduism. One example he gives is the fire-ritual or homa (although I do not understand what relevance does this have for Dzogchen). He also admits that Hinduism in turn took over some Buddhist elements.

Still, it all sounds very strange.

I would like to request the participants in this discussion to focus strictly on the false view in Dzogchen i.e. how it is being defined, the relevant quotes from primary sources (authoritative and accepted Dzogchen texts), the words of authentic and also living Dzogchen masters as well as the consequences of such false view for the practice of Dzogchen itself (the last point is of particular importance).

I do not want to sound bigoted or parochial when discussing with my friend. But on the other hand there are certain things one cannot simply explain away - even for the superficial purposes of some "religious" harmony or tolerance.

Malcolm wrote:

False view in Dzogchen is quite simply any view of existence or nonexistence. For example, the Self-Arisen Vidyā Tantra states:

Such false views as those
are held to be gathered into four:
tīrthikās, extremists,
hedonists and cārvākas.

The system of explaining these is as follows:
tīrthikās maintain permanent eternalism;
extremists maintain partial eternalism, partial annihilation;
hedonists maintain that annihilation is total annihilation;
Cārvākas maintain the annihilation of karmic results.

As such, the three hundred and sixty views as well
can be gathered into four categories.
Further those can be included
in eternalism and annihilationism.
Those can also be included in meaningless nihilism.
This is the extent of the worldly views.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 21st, 2015 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: Yogacara + Tathagatagarba = Shentong

Content:

smcj said:

I'm reading "When Clouds Part" by Brunnholzl and he has clarified something that was a bit confusing to me. He basically says that the Tibetan Shentong is a combination of Yogacara, specifically the 3 natures and 8 consciousnesses, plus an interpretation of the Tathagatagarbha doctrine. I had been confused about that and sort of thought that Yogacara and Tathagatagarba were the same.

Malcolm wrote:

You should trust what I tell you. I have made this point to you repeatedly over the years.

smcj said:

It also explains why a major text like Uttaratantra lacks the three natures schema yet is a mainstay of the Shentong view. Basically it was retroactively co-opted by the Shentongpas, although there were precursors in India.

Malcolm wrote:

It also explains why, for example, Longchenpa is not a gzhan stong pa. He considers tathāgatagarbha definitive, but places the teaching of the three natures within Yogacara and never uses them to explicate the meaning of the tathāgatagarba, since they are not necessary. There is no discussion of these in the Uttaratantra, per se. The Yogacara masters were not that interested in tathagatagarbha, quite frankly.

smcj said:

Brunnholzl makes another point that makes things convenient for a Kagyu Shentongpa

like me, which is that... Virtually all Kagyu masters hold the tathagata heart teaching on buddha nature to be of definitive meaning and deny that the tathagata heart is just sheer emptiness or a non implicative negation.

(p.69)

.

Malcolm wrote:

The only people who maintain this point of view are the Gelugpas, no one else.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 20th, 2015 at 11:01 PM

Title: Re: Mental Continuums, Rebirth, and the Brain

Content:

Matt J said:

The point I don't fully accept is this:

For that reason, when we talk about our "individual mental continuum," it doesn't come from the body – in other words, from matter and energy. Each moment of our individual mental continuum has to come from a previous moment of an individual, subjective experiencing of things. And it can't come from somebody else's individual, subjective experiencing of things, such as that of our parents. It can only be part of the continuum of our own individual, subjective experiencing of things.

Obviously, there is a relationship (and ultimately non-duality) between body and mind. And it is true that as far as we know, physical phenomenon don't become mental and vice versa. But why is it not possible for physical phenomenon to give rise to mental phenomenon? For example, when you hit my body with a piece of wood, pain arises. So while the wood doesn't become pain, it certainly produces it in a conventional way. So why can't physical phenomenon likewise "cause" the mind-stream to arise?

I feel that this is a key argument to understand. Any thoughts?

Malcolm wrote:

It is very simple, because of the homogeneity of causes and their effects, insentience cannot give rise to sentience.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 20th, 2015 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

dreambow said:

Whilst the input has been very interesting and people have shown themselves to be very erudite ...never the less the topic was ND Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta. Could we

please get back on track?

Malcolm wrote:

By demonstrating that there is no transpersonal basis in Dzogchen, it has been shown that there is a huge difference in meaning between what the term "nondual" means in Dzogchen and other systems.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 20th, 2015 at 12:01 AM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The gzhan stong/rang stong distinction is irrelevant to Dzogchen. Dzogchen negates the two truths, so of what use would there be in a distinction between gzhan stong and rang stong? As the Soaring Great Garuda states:

Since phenomena and nonphenomena have always been merged and are inseparable, there is no further need to explain an "ultimate phenomenon."

M

smcj said:

Well, for starters a lot of perpetual ideas begin to make sense, like the spontaneous appearance of buddhas apropos of people's karma.

Malcolm wrote:

No. If buddhas appear "apropos" of people's karma, that means buddhas are just delusions. Indeed, as Vidyādhara Mañjuśrimitra wrote in his seminal Meditation of Bodhicitta:

Because the awakening of the sugata does not exist, his magical apparitions appear to the deluded, similar to an illusion.

For those of you who do not know who Mañjuśrimitra was, he was Vidyādhara Garab Dorje's main disciple, credited with dividing Dzogchen tantras into three series according to emphasis.

So, therefore, the two truths, and the whole gzhan stong/rang stong debate along with them, remains completely irrelevant to Dzogchen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 19th, 2015 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

Matt J said:

Although he is the teacher of the current Dzogchen Ponlop Rinpoche, who says that many Nyingma and Kagyu Dzogchen teachers are shentongpas.

Malcolm wrote:

The gzhan stong/rang stong distinction is irrelevant to Dzogchen. Dzogchen negates the two truths, so of what use would there be in a distinction between gzhan stong and rang stong? As the Soaring Great Garuda states:

Since phenomena and nonphenomena have always been merged and are inseparable, there is no further need to explain an "ultimate phenomenon."

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 19th, 2015 at 2:08 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Nazis?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There is really no evidence that Hitler was influenced by Buddhism at all.

odysseus said:

No official scientific or research evidence, but there's something called "word of folk mouth". As a Buddhist, you know for yourself Malcolm...

Malcolm wrote:

There isn't even any evidence in his writing that would lead one to suspect so. He was utterly dismissive of Himmler's occult obsessions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 19th, 2015 at 12:51 AM

Title: Re: Buddhist Nazis?

Content:

odysseus said:

Hitler was a Buddhist - it's embarrassing...

Malcolm wrote:

No, he did not care for religion of any kind at all, much less Buddhism.

odysseus said:

Hitler believed in a perfect world like Utopia, by ideas he got from amongst others Buddhism. But his delusions were too much, so he never got enlightened.

Malcolm wrote:

There is really no evidence that Hitler was influenced by Buddhism at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Buddhist Nazis?

Content:

odysseus said:

Hitler was a Buddhist - it's embarrassing...

Malcolm wrote:

No, he did not care for religion of any kind at all, much less Buddhism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

smcj said:

I like the story about how buddhas spontaneously appear according to the karma of sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

So you are not going to answer the question?

smcj said:

I'm reading the book looking for that. And in doing so I am reminded that the entire book is basically about "how the universe is" (Mt. Meru, etc.). It has various cosmologies, that's why it is called "Myriad Worlds", which would be entirely in keeping with my interpretation of the basis as a basis for the universe. Also the chapter in question is titled "Primordial Purity of the Universe".

Malcolm wrote:

The title, Myriad Worlds, is a western title, not Kongtrul's title. It is just the first part of the Shes Bya Mdz od, lit., The Treasury of the Knowable.

Now then, if we take your line of reasoning, that the whole book is about the basis, how do you cope with the absurd consequence that Vajrasana, Vulture Peak, will exist in the basis, but the rest of the world will not? [see 143].

Instead, the notion of a basis [gzhi] is really only brought up in chapter iv. It begins on 173 by saying:

It is taught in scriptures that worlds and beings

Are created by various actions influenced by subtle and proliferation [emotions].

He then continues by listing the various approaches to the how the world and beings are created in various tenet systems. He then gives the Kalacakara account on 176:

"Most agree that in the formation [of the world], the mind is the agent..."

This whole section, up to page 181, takes the individual mind as the basis for the formation of the universe.

He then shifts to Hinayāna and Mahāyāna cosmology from 182 until 195.

He then introduces what he terms the ultimate view concerning the origin of samsara and the Dzogchen view.

The first is a detailed presentation of dependent origination. On 198, in the section on the relationship between dependent origination and the eight consciousnesses, he writes:

"The beginningless nature of the mind is clear, empty, [and] unobstructed, but its nature is not recognized...

Thus far, the basis described in the whole book is the mind or the nature of the mind.

It is only at the conclusion of this section that Kongtrul begins a description of the Dzogchen teaching on the basis. And there is nothing there which validates your interpretation that it is a so called transpersonal basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 12:29 PM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

smcj said:

I like the story about how buddhas spontaneously appear according to the karma of sentient beings.

Malcolm wrote:

So you are not going to answer the question?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 12:00 PM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

How does an individual mind come about, in the Dzogchen scheme of things?

dzogchungpa said:

Do tell.

Malcolm wrote:

I have countless times...but people don't listen...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 11:31 AM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

smcj said:

So my understanding is that "all the things of relative reality, your mind included" is transpersonal. If so Dudjom R. is also reading too much into it.

Malcolm wrote:

Sarvadharmas do not refer to all instances of every phenomena in the universe. It is a term which means all the phenomena of one's aggregates, sense bases and elements. All phenomena, for every sentient being, are restricted to these thirty-five dharmas.

smcj said:

So not only is it transpersonal, it is pre-personal. There are no sentient beings or buddhas present, so therefore there are no minds present at all. .

Malcolm wrote:

How does an individual mind come about, in the Dzogchen scheme of things? Is it created ex nihilo, out of nothing? Or is there something you may have perhaps overlooked? If you assume a transpersonal basis, then you have to explain how all these different minds arise from a uniform substance. And of course, you will get all caught up in the intellectual skeins of trying to reconcile the two truths, and all the other pyrotechnics that arise from incorrect interpretations of the Dzogchen teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 11:16 AM

Title: Re: Alcohol

Content:

Queequeg said:

Malcolm - are those authentic passages?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 5:54 AM

Title: Re: Alcohol

Content:

dharmagoat said:

Let's not forget that alcohol is both a poison and known carcinogen, and therefore not appropriate for "this precious human body".

Malcolm wrote:

It balances the humors and is beneficial for all illnesses, in particular, since it removes kapha, wind and combination illnesses, among medicines, it is the supreme medicinal amrita: the qualities of delicious booze are perfect.

dharmagoat said:

There is also the negative effect it has on mindfulness, something that a serious practitioner would be fully aware of.

Malcolm wrote:

Because it gathers the assembly of dakas and dakinis,
delights the assembly of yogeśvaras,
and is the samaya substance that perfects the two accumulations,
the qualities of delicious booze are perfect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: Alcohol

Content:

odysseus said:

The point is not to indulge.

Malcolm wrote:

The conceitedly clever Kadampa vināyadharas,
and the logicians, the Jodanpas and so on,
drink in secret, so whose craving is greater?
the qualities of delicious booze are perfect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 5:01 AM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

smcj said:

Yes, it is being used as an analogy. Why? Because it is making the point it is all-pervasive. Why else use the analogy?

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not the point that is being made. The point is being made the self-originated pristine consciousness has always been present just as space has always been present. It is a temporal metaphor here, not a spatial metaphor, as you take it to be.

smcj said:

The nature of everything else is ascertained to be mind in the Great Perfection teachings. The reason it is not the same as Yogacara is that the eight consciousnesses themselves arise from the delusion of not recognizing the basis when it arises. This is also covered on 212, paragraph three onward until we hit the end of this section on 215.

Ok, so "the 8 consciousnesses themselves arise from the delusion of not recognizing

the basis when it arises". So the basis is more fundamental than the 8 consciousnesses, right? And the basis is what is not recognized "when it arises", right?

Malcolm wrote:

The basis is nothing other than the self-originated pristine consciousness mentioned above. Also the ignorance that gives rise to the eight consciousnesses, etc. is just the ignorance [ma rig pa] which is the manifestation of rig pa itself, as mentioned on 215. So for example, he states on 222 that the five wisdoms of rig pa manifest as the five aggregates and so on. Not the five aggregates of all sentient beings, just your own five aggregates. Likewise, they then arise as the five afflictions, etc. Paragraph 2 on pg. 224., summarizes the six sets of five that arise from and are present in rig pa.

I think you are reading too much into the word gzhi, basis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 4:30 AM

Title: Re: Alcohol

Content:

Queequeg said:

Yay or nay and why?

Malcolm wrote:

Longchenpa says, among other things, in his Praise to Booze:
Since it increases the pure essence, the body and mind are happy,
since it generates bliss and heat, it increases samadhi,
and because realization arises since it produces knowledge,
the qualities of delicious booze are perfect..

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 4:27 AM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

smcj said:

However if he is talking about "self-existing wisdom, primordially present like space " in a context that excludes both sentient being and enlightened beings--which he is--you've got a problem.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no problem here at all. Why?, because space is merely being used here as a metaphor.

smcj said:

You've still got to discover it for yourself as the nature of your own mind. But it's the

nature of everything else too. To say otherwise would be to take the Yogacara view, which is not what we are talking about.

Malcolm wrote:

The nature of everything else is ascertained to be mind in the Great Perfection teachings. The reason it is not the same as Yogacara is that the eight consciousnesses themselves arise from the delusion of not recognizing the basis when it arises. This is also covered on 212, paragraph three onward until we hit the end of this section on 215.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 4:19 AM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

smcj said:

1. Is the basis devoid of samsara and nirvana?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, just as it is devoid of realization and non-realization.

smcj said:

2. Is the basis beyond causes and conditions?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, because it is original purity [ka dag].

smcj said:

3. Is interdependent origination merely a delusion when seen from the Dzogchen view?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, since it is produced by the imputing ignorance.

smcj said:

4. Does the basis have the attributes of clarity, unimpededness, and energy?

Malcolm wrote:

It is more accurate to say that the basis is a pristine consciousness or wisdom [ye shes] that possesses three attributes, essence, nature and compassion, or emptiness, clarity and the inseparability of the two.

smcj said:

5. Does the basis arise as the universe when unrecognized?

Malcolm wrote:

Only in a manner of speaking, it does not actually arise as the universe. The way this happens is summarized on 212, paragraph three.

smcj said:

6. Does the universe arise as the basis when recognized?

Malcolm wrote:

Again, only in a manner of speaking. The universe does not actually arise as the basis.

smcj said:

7. Are there any phenomena other than the basis expressing itself as appearance?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, delusion. This question is addressed in the paragraph mentioned above. There is no delusion in the basis, but there is delusion about the basis.

smcj said:

8. Is mind (sems) the basis?

Malcolm wrote:

No, mind is not the basis, but the mind arises from the what is described as the "creative dynamic of energy" in the forgoing paragraph.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 4:05 AM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, actually it is. Compare top of 206 to the pages I mentioned.

smcj said:

The first paragraph of 206 concludes with:

Kongtrul said:

It is great self-existing wisdom, primordially present like space.

Malcolm wrote:

That does not make it transpersonal, it just makes it a self-originated pristine consciousness, rang byung ye shes, i.e., one that one must discover for oneself as the nature of one's own mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 3:46 AM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:
smcj said:
So it's not applicable.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, actually it is. Compare top of 206 to the pages I mentioned.

The fact is that this is standard presentation found in many places. The fact that you have badly misunderstood it merely points to the need for people to rely on qualified teachers. Otherwise, misunderstandings like yours [that the buddhanature present in all sentient beings is one transpersonal entity] are sure to happen.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 3:05 AM
Title: Re: Tobacco
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
Nay. Polonium 210.

http://www.nytimes.com/2006/12/01/opinion/01proctor.html?_r=0

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 3:02 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.

Malcolm wrote:
As I said, you really do not understand this teaching. You are entitled to your misunderstandings, but you are not entitled to your own facts.

If you carefully read ppg. 222-224 of the book you cite, you will see how impossible your transpersonal position actually is.

M

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 2:38 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
smcj said:
Having just quoted both of them saying that, I am going to disagree with you.

Malcolm wrote:
You are misreading them.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 1:36 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.

Malcolm wrote:
No, since the Dzogchen tantras explicitly reject Advaita Vedanta.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, December 18th, 2015 at 1:35 AM
Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta
Content:
smcj said:
My understanding is that it is transpersonal. Kongtrul and Dudjom both seem to say it.

Malcolm wrote:
Neither of them make this claim.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Thursday, December 17th, 2015 at 9:50 AM
Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen
Content:
smcj said:
My reading of the above is that Longchenpa is using the analogy of a mirror to explain something different than what the Dudjom R. quotation is about. So although they both use the analogy of a mirror, they are actually talking about apples and oranges.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, and when I brought up the example, I was using it differently than you are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 17th, 2015 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Matt J said:

So there are external objects after all for Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, as Longchenpa famously quips, when we stop looking at a mountain, it does not just disappear.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 17th, 2015 at 3:48 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

smcj said:

Uh, no. The premise of the analogy specifically disallows that interpretation.

Malcolm wrote:

Uh yes, the premise of the analogy requires that interpretation.

smcj said:

Uh, no, it doesn't. Specifically the line... These things appear naturally on the "magic" mirror,

..is unambiguously making that point. They appear naturally. There are no referents. In the analogy there is nothing besides the images and the mirror, as Dudjom R. explains: 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 in it.

So that sentence includes the absence of referents and the appearance of the images-- in the same sentence. That's kinda hard to work around.

Malcolm wrote:

This does not address my point. You are so caught up in your opinions, you cannot see outside of your own reflection.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 17th, 2015 at 3:25 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

smcj said:

Uh, no. The premise of the analogy specifically disallows that interpretation.

Malcolm wrote:

Uh yes, the premise of the analogy requires that interpretation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 17th, 2015 at 2:44 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen Cycles

Content:

shanehanner said:

Hi,

I keep seeing different teachers with different "cycles" of teachings and would like to know what the differences are?

For example, this is from Tara Mandalas website...

"He also said that the Dzinpa Rangdröl cycle was very complete starting with Ngöndro, followed by the yidam practices of Tsogyel Karmo (White Tsogyel) and Tröma, and then proceeding through the six yogas, and ending with Dzog Chen in a section very similar to Tri Yeshe Lama (Jigme Lingpa's Dzog Chen cycle from Longchen Nyingtig) which includes complete Trekchö and Tögal instructions. He also mentioned that Dzinpa Rangdröl contains several Chöd practices and many Dzog Chen men-ngags (pith instructions)."

So, what are the different cycles? Is there a certain period that they start? Are some considered better than others? Any background info would be great!

Malcolm wrote:

"Cycle" is a translation of the Tibetan "skor." This word means something like cycle, and in this sense, we are using the term like in the Wagner's Ring Cycle, a series of interrelated but independent works.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 17th, 2015 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Are there appearances without signs?

smcj said:

Insisting that the appearances require some third thing outside the mirror to reflect, which is what I understand you are doing, is not accepting the premise of the analogy.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, a third thing is required, secondary conditions. For example, in order for a red ball to show up in a mirror, there has to be a red ball from which a reflection is derived.

What exactly is an "appearance" in your mind?

In the context of this discussion, "appearances" are the basis arising as the universe.

And how does that happen?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 17th, 2015 at 1:26 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

smcj said:

Let me ask you, smcj, do mirrors bother looking into themselves?

No, of course not. However the premise of the analogy is that there are images in the mirror without referents. You are ignoring the premise of the analogy and taking it too literally.

What you are talking about seems to me to be more appropriate for completion stage/Anu Yoga practice. Ati Yoga (roughly equivalent to "Non-Dual Tantra in HYT) is about appearances simultaneously present with emptiness, not the absence of appearances.

Malcolm wrote:

Are there appearances without signs? What exactly is an "appearance" in your mind?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 16th, 2015 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: Father Francis Tiso Dzogchen & Early Christianity Connec

Content:

tingdzin said:

Guenther was also of the view, which I happen to share, that Dzogchen is rather anomalous to Indian Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't see how this could possibly apply to so called sems sde texts. The rhetoric of "bodhicitta" in sems sde is identical to that found for example in the Guhyasamaja.

Second, we have no evidence whatsoever of any thögal like teachings being written down by anyone until the early 11th century, whether Buddhist or Bon.

In terms of unique doctrines, the most unique thing in Bonpo Dzogchen is ZZNG's emphasis on sounds, lights and rays, which really only figures in the ZZNG, and it pretty much absent from other Bonpo Dzogchen cycles, based on a electronic word search conducted on the other two main cycles of Dzogchen in Bon.

While I would have no complaints about sourcing Dzogchen in Central Asia, within the sphere of Indian cultural influence, I see absolutely no evidence which links Dzogchen doctrines with teachings generally outside of Buddhadharma and the Indian context.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 15th, 2015 at 9:46 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Tsongkhapa Madhyamaka

Content:

T. Chokyi said:

I remember posting in a thread called: "Gelug View of Dzogchen?", my point was that Khenpo Achos a Gelugpa Abbot achieved rainbow body. The person I was talking with is a Gelugpa monk at Sera Je, so you'd probably enjoy reading it:

Topic: <https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=52&t=10207&start=20#p128727>

Tsongkhapafan said:

A wonderful achievement but the rainbow body can be achieved by practising the two stages of Highest Yoga Tantra. Maybe this is what he was practising. It would be more typically Gelug.

Malcolm wrote:

Dudjom Lingpa's Meteoric Razor Vajrakīlaya cycle actually, and its associated Dzogchen instructions. I have read through his collected works, apart from a very long important commentary he wrote on Dudjom Lingpa's Vajrakīlaya cycle. When he was young, he was a student of Trijang Rinpoche, but then he met Dudjom Rinpoche and his practice became centered around Vajrakīlaya and Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 15th, 2015 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Unknown Buddhist Images - Please help in identifying the

Content:

Richard Egan said:

I got these image f rom a friend of a friend who bought them in Tibet. They have a front and back and I am trying to identify what they represent. Any help at all will be appreciated. Thanks.

<http://vps30393849.123-vps.co.uk/img/Buddhist-images-1A.jpg>

<http://vps30393849.123-vps.co.uk/img/Buddhist-images-1B.jpg>

<http://vps30393849.123-vps.co.uk/img/Buddhist-images-2A.jpg>

<http://vps30393849.123-vps.co.uk/img/Buddhist-images-2B.jpg>

<http://vps30393849.123-vps.co.uk/img/Buddhist-images-3A.jpg>

<http://vps30393849.123-vps.co.uk/img/Buddhist-images-3B.jpg>

Malcolm wrote:

They are initiation cards, and are standard deities from the general preaceful and wrathful mandala, the buddhas of the six realms and so on, but in this case look

connected to some kind of Avalokiteshvara empowerment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 15th, 2015 at 1:31 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Tsongkhapa Madhyamaka

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

There have been practitioners of Dzogchen among the Gelugpas from the time of Tsongkhapa onwards. Never everyone in Tibet was a Sarma bigot.

smcj said:

Although that may be true, the degree to which it is true is reflected by the amount of pushback HHDL has had when he invites Nyingma lamas to teach at his monasteries.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a more modern issue. Mostly a twentieth century issue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 15th, 2015 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Tsongkhapa Madhyamaka

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Gelugpas practise the two stages of Highest Yoga Tantra as the direct path to enlightenment and there's no need to practise anything else. Tsongkhapa never taught Dzogchen and it's not part of the Gelugpa tradition.

swooping said:

But some Gelugpas do practice it.

smcj said:

These days. That's new.

Malcolm wrote:

Not that new. There have been practitioners of Dzogchen among the Gelugpas from the time of Tsongkhapa onwards. Never everyone in Tibet was a Sarma bigot.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 15th, 2015 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Ngondro

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Aside from liturgy, Vajrasattva and mandala offerings appear as preliminaries when? We're they done in India?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they are mentioned in Guhyasamaja Tantra, etc. Mandala offerings are strictly part of Vajrayāna, in origin.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 14th, 2015 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Anarchist Buddhist teachers, present and past?

Content:

madhusudan said:

Can you describe your confidence in the state so that I might begin to understand?

Malcolm wrote:

You should read Nozick, Anarchy, State and Utopia, where he sets out the minimum conditions for a state, and why this is more desirable than anarchy.

We have discharged our task of explaining how a state would arise from a state of nature without anyone's rights being violated. The moral objections of the individualist anarchist to the minimal state are overcome. It is not an unjust imposition of a monopoly; the de facto monopoly grows by an invisible-hand process and by morally permissible means, without anyone's rights being violated and without any claims being made to a special right that others do not possess. And requiring the clients of the de facto monopoly to pay for the protection of those they prohibit from self-help enforcement against them, far from being immoral, is morally required by the principle of compensation adumbrated in Chapter 4.

Nozick, Robert (2013-11-12). Anarchy, State, and Utopia (pp. 114-115). Basic Books. Kindle Edition.

madhusudan said:

Thank you for your reply. I will move that book up to the top of my reading list and process its arguments. As my perspective shifts, however, I am beginning to see political circumstances as an expression of people's delusions, and so I find myself viewing solutions more from a spiritual outlook.

As an aside, what would you view as being more fruitful: reading Nozick (becoming more informed), or admitting my own attachment to debates and thought constructs, admitting I am wrong and delusional, taking refuge and spending more time with the cushion? I guess each sickness has its own particular medicine, but a long running dichotomy for me has been between philosophy and experiential intuitive definitive knowledge (direct perception?). Thanks for any words on this.

Malcolm wrote:

I think that Dharma is good for personal evolution, but we do not inhabit a world of Dharma practitioners, and Dharma ethics do not translate to those who do not follow the Dharma. Therefore, we need to develop robust, positive secular understandings and doctrines and as Dharma practitioners, advocate for them and support them. It's the Mahāyāna thing to do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 14th, 2015 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Anarchist Buddhist teachers, present and past?

Content:

madhusudan said:

Can you describe your confidence in the state so that I might begin to understand?

Malcolm wrote:

You should read Nozick, Anarchy, State and Utopia, where he sets out the minimum conditions for a state, and why this is more desirable than anarchy.

We have discharged our task of explaining how a state would arise from a state of nature without anyone's rights being violated. The moral objections of the individualist anarchist to the minimal state are overcome. It is not an unjust imposition of a monopoly; the de facto monopoly grows by an invisible-hand process and by morally permissible means, without anyone's rights being violated and without any claims being made to a special right that others do not possess. And requiring the clients of the de facto monopoly to pay for the protection of those they prohibit from self-help enforcement against them, far from being immoral, is morally required by the principle of compensation adumbrated in Chapter 4.

Nozick, Robert (2013-11-12). Anarchy, State, and Utopia (pp. 114-115). Basic Books. Kindle Edition.

ovi said:

While I completely agree that 'anarcho'-capitalism would recreate the state, there are 3 flaws with your argument:

- anarcho-capitalists are not anarchists
- anarchists are not market fundamentalists; the vast majority completely reject the market economy
- the problem that anarchists have with the state isn't that it originates in an immoral way, but that it is a hierarchical and authoritarian organization

Malcolm wrote:

I never mentioned anarcho-capitalists.

No one can reject a market economy, there have and always will be markets.

Nozick proves that these hierarchies are inevitable. The monopoly he is talking about it is a monopoly of force, not trade. You should read his book in detail. I don't agree with everything he says, because it is too idealistic, being the idealism driving modern day "small govt." Republicans like Rand Paul. But he has given a good account of why a state is preferable to anarchy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 14th, 2015 at 9:25 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Ngondro

Content:

heart said:

Interesting info Malcolm, thank you. So is the Samantabhadri Tantra of the Sun of the Luminous Expanse (kun tu bzang mo klong gsal nyi ma'i rgyud) as old as the other 17 tantras?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you mean by old. Chronologically, it is a terma that was probably revealed during the 13th century. That being said, I have never seen a clear account of its revelation anywhere, unlike say, that of the 17 tantras. However, the Khandro Nyingthig is a self-described commentary on it, and since it dates to the early 14th, it is a good guess that this tantra was revealed in the 13th. It seems the first cycle of teachings that mention its existence is the Khandro Nyinthig. Also, in the 14th century, Dorje Lingpa revealed further tantras with similar names.

heart said:

So is there an earlier example of ngondro instructions than this 13th century Dzogchen tantra?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

There are examples of texts called chos spyods, "Dharma Practice" texts which generally consist of various regular and general prayers, including refuge and bodhicitta formulas and so on, but as a system of liturgy, we don't really to see what we would recognize as "ngondro texts" until the thirteenth century and fourteenth centuries. There is a guy who posts here, Zim Pickens, who spent a lot of time studying the issue of the origins of Ngondro liturgies. If he sees this post, maybe he will have more info.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 12th, 2015 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Ngondro

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

That's why I think it is important to recognize the nature of the mind as soon as possible for someone who wants to practice Dzogchen.

Karma_Yeshe said:

Although certain people don't understand this, in a real sense, this is a no-brainer.

There is no practice of Dzogchen without recognition of rigpa at all.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not exactly true. It is more accurate to say that without introduction there is no practice of Dzogchen. There are practices that are part of the path of Dzogchen for people who have not yet recognized the basis such as rushen, semzin and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 12th, 2015 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: Chan, Mahamudra, and Tibet

Content:

mzaur said:

Hi everyone,

I was just listening to a Dharma Ocean podcast (130: Pure Awareness) and Reggie Ray said some things which he said may be a bit heretical to some but actually are historically accurate. To me it sounds very odd, and I haven't heard these things before. I was hoping someone with more experience can comment about the points he makes? I typed up the relevant stuff. Is any of it true? Is there any evidence of Chan influence on Mahamudra?

What we call Mahamudra tradition is result of profound interaction of Daoism, Chan Buddhism, and Dzogchen. Mahamudra came out of that. There's a lot of Daoism in Mahamudra, and a lot of Chan Buddhism in Mahamudra.

In the 8th century in Tibet, there was a very famous conversation about what is the best Buddhism for Tibet, and an edict which has been found in the Dun Huang documents buried and survived. The edict says the most important tradition for Tibet and the meditative tradition everyone should practice is Chan Buddhism. What happened later was the Indian crew showed up and they took over the power in Tibet. This was like in the 11th/12th century and they made it illegal to practice anything that was from China. So all of the records were rewritten to show that everything that was good in Tibet came from India but actually this was a complete fabrication. There is extensive evidence that Mahamudra is the result of the confluence of Chan Buddhism, Daoism, and Dzogchen. They were part of the same tradition. Well you can say what is that tradition? It's the practice of pure awareness. They were all doing it, and they were talking to each other.

There's a tradition called Sutra Mahamudra taught by Gampopa which has now been more or less proved was a Chan lineage in Tibet but because of the politics they could not acknowledge their source.

I called up my friends and academic friends, and they said, yeah that's how it is. The history of Tibetan Buddhism promoted in Tibet is a complete fabrication.

It's often said that Chan Buddhism is Daoism in a Buddhist form . . . What happened was, the Buddhists saved Daoism in China. Because Daoism after the Han Dynasty

began to become very conventional religion. The Buddhists showed up from India and realized like holy shit, these people understand more about awareness than we do. And they incorporate the depths of Daoism, and they gave Daoism the container and practice and gave Daoism a way to survive.

Malcolm wrote:

There are so many inaccuracies and exaggerations here, it is hard to know where to begin.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 12th, 2015 at 6:41 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Ngondro

Content:

Kelwin said:

Maybe recognition isn't so special. But when recognition is there, doing ngondro etc might still be the best option. Just recognizing the essence every now and then doesn't mean there's no gradual path anymore. In fact, ego and arrogance are still very much available afterwards. Going from experience to realization is much more work than going from nothing to the first experiences. One lama told me that the real work actually begins after recognition.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no gradual path at all in Dzogchen. If it is a gradual path, it is not the path of Dzogchen.

Kelwin said:

The truly rare thing, is the first recognition immediately resulting in stable realization.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes,

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 12th, 2015 at 3:07 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Ngondro

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

Only very special practitioners recognize that nature of the mind when the first introduction happens. It's something very rare.

Malcolm wrote:

No, what I would say is rare is a teacher who is able to give confidence to such people (who are not actually so rare) that their recognition is in fact a true recognition. The reason for this is that while the methods work, there are not many clairvoyant teachers out there, so those who are not clairvoyant are unable to ascertain without long

observation whether their students have really understood the main point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 12th, 2015 at 3:04 AM

Title: Re: Anarchist Buddhist teachers, present and past?

Content:

madhusudan said:

Can you describe your confidence in the state so that I might begin to understand?

Malcolm wrote:

You should read Nozick, Anarchy, State and Utopia, where he sets out the minimum conditions for a state, and why this is more desirable than anarchy.

We have discharged our task of explaining how a state would arise from a state of nature without anyone's rights being violated. The moral objections of the individualist anarchist to the minimal state are overcome. It is not an unjust imposition of a monopoly; the de facto monopoly grows by an invisible-hand process and by morally permissible means, without anyone's rights being violated and without any claims being made to a special right that others do not possess. And requiring the clients of the de facto monopoly to pay for the protection of those they prohibit from self-help enforcement against them, far from being immoral, is morally required by the principle of compensation adumbrated in Chapter 4.

Nozick, Robert (2013-11-12). Anarchy, State, and Utopia (pp. 114-115). Basic Books. Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 12th, 2015 at 2:48 AM

Title: Re: Chod in gelug buddhism

Content:

Manjushri Fan said:

Hi

I'm not sure if this is in the wrong section, so I apologise to Mods if it is.

My questions are:

Is chod practiced in gelug buddhism, and if so, do you know any examples of teachers. And are any empowerments required to practice chod.

Malcolm wrote:

The answer to both questions is yes. Lama Zopa teaches it, among others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 12th, 2015 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: Conception and Contraception

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In other words, IUD's create a situation where the sperm is basically poisoned.

fckw said:

Which is therefore not much different from what antibiotics do.

Malcolm wrote:

A spermatozoa is not, so far as we known, sentient, it is a tissue.

The issue of bacterial sentience on the other hand is complicated.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 12th, 2015 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Ngondro

Content:

Adamantine said:

thanks for the link Magnus.

Malcolm wrote:

I feel it is important to point out that it is not so simple as the way EPK presents it. For example, prior to the common and uncommon preliminaries, the tantra describes conferral of the elaborate vase empowerment [chapter 61]. Chapters sixty-two through through eighty-eight describe all of the preliminaries from contemplating the time of death through the separation of samsara and nirvana. Chapter eighty-nine explains the secret empowerment, and ninety covers creation and completion, while chapters ninety-one through ninety-eight cover trekchö. Chapter ninety-nine covers the third empowerment and the practice connected with passion. The rest of the tantra concerns thogal. In other words, the tantra maps various practices in relation with the four empowerments — elaborate, unelaborate, very unelaborate and extremely unelaborate.

So what are the first sixty chapters about? All kinds of things. Chapters 1-46 are concerned exclusively with Dzogchen theory. Chapters 47-60 are all about the guru and disciple and conditions for transmission.

M

heart said:

Interesting info Malcolm, thank you. So is the Samantabhadri Tantra of the Sun of the Luminous Expanse (kun tu bzang mo klong gsal nyi ma'i rgyud) as old as the other 17 tantras?

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what you mean by old. Chronologically, it is a terma that was probably

revealed during the 13th century. That being said, I have never seen a clear account of its revelation anywhere, unlike say, that of the 17 tantras. However, the Khandro Nyingthig is a self-described commentary on it, and since it dates to the early 14th, it is a good guess that this tantra was revealed in the 13th. It seems the first cycle of teachings that mention its existence is the Khandro Nyinthig. Also, in the 14th century, Dorje Lingpa revealed further tantras with similar names.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 12th, 2015 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Ngondro

Content:

heart said:

Semdzins, rushans and lojongs are Dzogchen preliminaries (ngondro). Rushan is practiced in all Dzogchen cycles I know about and lojongs in all cycles that comes through Vimalamitra. Just learned recently that there are no inner Rushan (six lokas) in the Vima Nyingtik so that exist only in cycles coming from Padmasambhava.

/magnus

Malcolm wrote:

Whoever told you this is mistaken. The rushan of purifying the six lokas is found in the first of the three Last Testaments of The Buddhas in the first volume of the Vima sNying thig.

Since this body was created by the ignorant mind stream, within it are the seeds of the six lokas. Because vidyā is the real three kāyas, the three kāyas arise as the three syllables. Separation is gaining proficiency in the syllables.

The syllables of the six lokas are well known from various mahāyoga and anuyoga tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 11th, 2015 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: In search of a specific verse

Content:

timtim2016 said:

This may be a long shot but here it goes: A few years back I remember reading a classic text which contained a verse in a criticism/response format, where a generic "Theravadan" make a criticism of the authority of Mahayana texts. The "Response:" was something along the lines of how the Theravadan texts were not written by the Victor nor could they reliably relay his teachings. I believe later in the text it talked about knowingly and intentionally prefacing Mahayan texts as if they relayed teachings taught by the Victor, but doing so specifically to draw new followers and protect these people from thinking the Theravadan texts were more authoritative because they were prefaced in a similar way (as if they were reliably relaying teachings traceable to the Buddha).

I think it may be Dharmakirti or Nagarjuna, and as mentioned the verse is structured like:

Theravadan/Hinayanen: so and so
Response: so and so

I am sorry if this is far too vague. Thank you all for your time.

Malcolm wrote:
It is in the Ratnavali of Nāgārjuna.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, December 11th, 2015 at 10:03 PM
Title: Re: Conception and Contraception
Content:
Kelwin said:

And when does this transference take place, related to conception? (I heard at the moment of meeting of essences, but also heard after 3 months or so)
Conception can only occur if three things are present, a bardo being seeking rebirth, healthy sperm and healthy ovum.

Conception has already taken place, in the sense that sperm and egg have united.

Malcolm wrote:
No, this is not accurate.
Another form of contraception approved by the FDA – the copper Intrauterine Device CuT380A (Cu-IUD) – is effective as an EC when inserted up to five days following intercourse. Copper ions released from the IUD create an environment that is toxic to sperm, preventing fertilization.¹⁴ Copper can also alter the endometrial lining, but studies show that this alteration can prevent implantation, but not disrupt implantation. Because Cu-IUDs prevent rather than disrupt pregnancy, they too are properly classified as contraceptives, not abortifacients.
<http://www.acog.org/-/media/Departments/Government-Relations-and-Outreach/FactsAreImportantEC.pdf?dmc=1&ts=20150127T1149330103>

In other words, IUD's create a situation where the sperm is basically poisoned.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, December 11th, 2015 at 9:55 PM
Title: Re: Importance of a Dharma Teacher/Oral Transmission
Content:
paël said:
Finland.

Malcolm wrote:
You should contact Tulku Dagpa. He lives in Helsinki and speaks English well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 11th, 2015 at 6:53 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Ngondro

Content:

Adamantine said:

Even ChNN's uncle Togden Urgyen Tenzin who was one of the few well documented cases of modern rainbow-body did like 10 million prostrations to purify the obscurations of the body according to his Guru Adzom Drukpa's instructions..

Malcolm wrote:

It is well known that Togden Urgyen Tenzin was mentally ill when he first went to see Adzom Drugpa.

Adamantine said:

Who knows, if he didnt follow his Guru's advice because he didn't think that prostrations were Dzogchen enough of a practice maybe he would not have displayed rainbow body and we wouldn't have this incredible source of inspiration.

Malcolm wrote:

I am certain he achieved rainbow body by following Adzom Drugpa's advice.

Adamantine said:

What's always emphasized is that the most important thing is Guru Yoga, which involves faith in the guru and following the wisdom of their insight and instructions. So if ones Guru tells you to do ngondro, or if they tell you not to do ngondro, or to do 10,000 of each accumulation not 100,000 or just to do it until signs arise, etc..

Malcolm wrote:

If you have no faith in a guru who tells you to do ngondro, ngondro is not going to work for you. If you gave faith in a guru who tells you that you don't need ngondro, ngondro is not going to work for you. Faith is not something you should contrive. You either have it or you don't. If you don't have faith in a teacher, why should you do what he or she says?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 11th, 2015 at 6:24 AM

Title: Re: Conception and Contraception

Content:

tingdzin said:

The classical Buddhist approach is to say that three things are necessary: white essence of the father, red essence of the mother, and the presence of a "gandharva". This theory has often seemed to me to be based on fairly crude data from a scientific viewpoint: someone once worked out that the size of a sperm cell is many times smaller than that given for the size of the male essence in the scriptures -- I believe it is said to be the size of a sesame seed there. Further, a gandharva -- the name means "feeds on

fragrance" -- is some sort of discarnate being, though how precisely this gandharva is supposed to relate to the vijnana, which is said to be that aspect of a person's mental functioning that is carried over from one life to the next, is something I have never seen well explained -- perhaps someone here will have a better idea.

Malcolm wrote:

The gandharva is the name for the series of five skandhas in the bardo, according to the Kośha.

The Vajramāla Tantra explains that ālayavijñāna inseparable from mahāprāṇavāyu is what transfers in the bardo between bodies.

IUD's do not kill a fetus. They prevent conception.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 11th, 2015 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Ngondro

Content:

smcj said:

Did you discuss it with your teacher?

Seriously, how do you know that your reaction wasn't exactly what was supposed to be happening? Only someone that has successfully gone through the process and has come out the other side has any understanding of it. Going into it, all your reference points are nothing more than your own opinions/preferences/ignorance and invalid. The fact you didn't like matters nothing at all.

Malcolm wrote:

You do understand you are being pretty disrespectful?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 11th, 2015 at 2:26 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Ngondro

Content:

Tongnyid Dorje said:

interesting post and opinions. although ChNNR doesnt teach necessity of ngondro in general, he requires it at SMS training, and he is trying to make it meaningful, not to count numbers, but have a real experience. especially at first level,

Paul said:

Do you specifically mean the 4 * 100,000? There is of course Dzogchen specific ngondro: semdzins, rushens and kumbhaka. I know that's definitely in the SMS program.

Malcolm wrote:

In the first level, one is to do a bit of the ngondro practice described by Sogdog pa Lodo

Gyaltsen, beginning with refuge, bodhicitta, etc. One to three weeks of each, in retreat if one can.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 11th, 2015 at 1:59 AM

Title: Re: Importance of a Dharma Teacher/Oral Transmission

Content:

pael said:

So, is my body mandala complete? I have muscle dystrophy. I can't walk.

Malcolm wrote:

In Dzogchen, the tantric idea of the body mandala is not important.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 11th, 2015 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

pael said:

How do they rose? Where is Ananda? Who arises them out of cessation?

Malcolm wrote:

Buddhas rouse them from cessation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 11th, 2015 at 12:55 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Matt J said:

Yes but isn't the goal of Mahayana omniscience as opposed to cessation?

Malcolm wrote:

Of course. This is why arhats are roused out of cessation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 10th, 2015 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Ngondro

Content:

Dechen Norbu said:

It's just another soundbite claiming Dzogchen practitioners forcefully need to practice ngondro if they wanna get it right and anyone saying otherwise is just creating bad karma. Nothing new really. As old as the religious version of Tibetan history in fact. And probably as bogus. (now I'll run for cover fast!)

(although more often than not I find myself thinking how great is ngondro practice when compared to others...)

Malcolm wrote:

Well, this is the traditional way, and teachers who continue to teach the traditional way are going to teach that way.

It is up for everyone to find their own path. It is never a good idea to tell people they do not need to do Ngondro [since clearly someone is telling them they should]. It is a good idea to tell people they should go and receive Dzogchen teachings. Once they have received Dzogchen teachings, they can decide for themselves whether they wish to make use of the methods of the lower yānas or not, depending on their circumstances. It is not our job to condition people. If they have the karma to meet Dzogchen teachings, they will. If not, there is nothing we or they can do about it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 10th, 2015 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: question on the types of blessing pills

Content:

jmlee369 said:

In Gelug, I am not aware of any generic nectar (dudtsi) pill. Rather, we have the inner offering pill (nangchö rilbu) which is pretty much a requisite for those practising Highest Yoga Tantra, and vase pills of HYT and kriya tantra, which are different formulations of the 25 vase substances in pill form. There is also the chulen pill for doing chulen practice, and the famous mani pills which are blessed with recitations of mani mantras. It seems that HH the Dalai Lama's temple does produce a dutsi chömen pill as part of a medicine retreat, but I'm not clear what the nature of that pill is. I also happen to possess some pills from Ganden Jangtse which contain various substances such as tormas used in rituals performed by HH the Dalai Lama, substances from the two tutors, substances such as blessed vase water from the practices of deities of the four classes of tantra and the extensive consecration ritual, etc etc.

As for the Tamdrin dudtsi, it could be made from a collection of substances that were blessed through the practice of Hayagriva, most likely made at Sera Je.

Malcolm wrote:

This is a Nyingma system, so ultimately done according to the Nyingma tradition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 10th, 2015 at 10:38 PM

Title: Re: question on the types of blessing pills

Content:

pemachophel said:

Loppon,

Do you know if all texts for the manufacture and consecration of dudtshi are terma?

The only ones I know for sure are.

Malcolm wrote:

No, there are texts in Sakya written by Dragpa Gyaltsen and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 10th, 2015 at 10:29 PM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Matt J said:

This is what is more or less espoused by many modern followers of the Suttas/Theravadins. I've also been slowly reading through Jamgon Kongtrul's Myriad Worlds and I find it interesting that in the Hinayana worldview he describes a descent from the formless samadhi realms to the lower, the higher the better and the lower being more blissful than the one above it. Which makes "neither perception nor non-perception" the pinnacle of samsara.

But this POV seems to be rejected in the Mahayana and beyond.

Malcolm wrote:

if you follow Peter Harvey's reasoning, what the Buddha intended by the term nirvana was a stream of unconditioned consciousness after the conditioned aggregates ceased. Well, it is and it isn't. According to Mahāyāna, arhats are roused out of their samadhi and returned to the bodhisattva stages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 10th, 2015 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Ngondro

Content:

Adamantine said:

thanks for the link Magnus.

Malcolm wrote:

I feel it is important to point out that it is not so simple as the way EPK presents it. For example, prior to the common and uncommon preliminaries, the tantra describes conferral of the elaborate vase empowerment [chapter 61]. Chapters sixty-two through eighty-eight describe all of the preliminaries from contemplating the time of death through the separation of samsara and nirvana. Chapter eighty-nine explains the secret empowerment, and ninety covers creation and completion, while chapters ninety-one through ninety-eight cover trekchö. Chapter ninety-nine covers the third empowerment and the practice connected with passion. The rest of the tantra concerns thogal. In other words, the tantra maps various practices in relation with the four

empowerments — elaborate, unelaborate, very unelaborate and extremely unelaborate.

So what are the first sixty chapters about? All kinds of things. Chapters 1-46 are concerned exclusively with Dzogchen theory. Chapters 47-60 are all about the guru and disciple and conditions for transmission.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 10th, 2015 at 9:22 PM

Title: Re: Importance of a Dharma Teacher/Oral Transmission

Content:

tingdzin said:

There is a story in the Nyingmapa tradition about a man who was so old and not in control of his body that he had to use a support to keep his chin up in meditation. By practicing single-mindedly, he is supposed to have attained the ultimate.

Malcolm wrote:

The fact that he had Vairocana as his teacher and Dzogchen Longde as his path helped considerably as well...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 10th, 2015 at 7:09 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Matt J said:

Well, I don't know. For instance, some schools describe never-ending blank nothingness as the final goal, which sounds really depressing. Also, it doesn't sound very Buddhistic--- practicing to achieve some type of eternal cessation.

But if I ask, are there aggregates in nirvana? Someone might say "No!", and I would think "Oh man, blank nothing!" but perhaps they really mean "But there are wisdom lights" or something along those lines.

Malcolm wrote:

if you follow Peter Harvey's reasoning, what the Buddha intended by the term nirvana was a stream of unconditioned consciousness after the conditioned aggregates ceased.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 10th, 2015 at 6:03 AM

Title: Re: question on the types of blessing pills

Content:

ngodrup said:

The answer was, "its because the view, the ritual and substance standards are higher for doing this in the Nyingma." .

Malcolm wrote:

The reason is that the theory is different. It has nothing to do with standards.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 10th, 2015 at 5:58 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

smcj said:

The status of the images us just what you said, they are the potential of the mirror to reflect.

Malcolm wrote:

The potential of the mirror is there whether there are images or not. The images [sems] that form out of the potential [rtsal] of the mirror [rig pa] are not intrinsic to that mirror's potential.

Secondly, I have to ask: you have long declared you are not interested in Dzogchen, so I really have to wonder why you bother commenting on these issues???

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 10th, 2015 at 5:18 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

smcj said:

All phenomena of relative reality are void by nature. Deceptively they appear truly to exist, but do not really do so. Yet from voidness various distinct appearances do arise, for instance forms. They are reflections of the "magic" mirror, voidness, and appear distinctly as your aggregates and as the consciousness, cognitive power and objects of your mind and senses.

Malcolm wrote:

Are there aggregates in nirvana?

You are not asking the right question -- of course, for sentient beings there are images in the mirror. As our friend here reminds us, we are not trying to recognize the mirror, we are the mirror. Whether or not there are appearances in the mirror, the nature of the mirror, its potential, always can reflect. That is what we are interested, not the status of the images, if there are any.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 10th, 2015 at 4:54 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

smcj said:

My understanding is that, as Malcolm points out, there are no referential objects anymore. Having referential objects creating the reflections would be positing some third thing besides the mirror and the images on it. That's taking the analogy too far. However the analogy does not deny that there are images on the mirror. What were thought to be phenomena are now understood to be nothing more than images on the mirror, as per your quoted post above Vasana. But somehow Malcolm goes from that to something like "there are no images at all". That is like saying that nothing appears ever. That's one step too far for my understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

Images require signs, where can there be signs in a signless state?

smcj said:

They are the display of the potential of bodhicitta, as per your post:

Malcolm wrote:

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.

Let me ask you, smcj, do mirrors bother looking into themselves?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 10th, 2015 at 4:17 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

smcj said:

My understanding is that, as Malcolm points out, there are no referential objects anymore. Having referential objects creating the reflections would be positing some third thing besides the mirror and the images on it. That's taking the analogy too far. However the analogy does not deny that there are images on the mirror. What were thought to be phenomena are now understood to be nothing more than images on the mirror, as per your quoted post above Vasana. But somehow Malcolm goes from that to something like "there are no images at all". That is like saying that nothing appears ever. That's one step too far for my understanding.

Malcolm wrote:

Images require signs, where can there be signs in a signless state?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 10th, 2015 at 4:15 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

cloudburst said:

but we can't call a chair unconditioned just because it is a union of form and emptiness. Similarly it makes no sense to call Vidya an unconditioned thing when it is a union, no different.

If vidyā is conditioned and impermanent, then buddhahood would be conditioned and impermanent.

The third Dodrupchen claims the essence of annuttaratāntra is the same as vidya. Whether you call the dharmata of mind compounded or uncompounded is a matter of perspective.

Malcolm wrote:

Od' sal taught for example in the Jñānavajrasammucaya tantra is the same thing we are discussing:

That which arises from luminosity
is "mind," [citta] "intellect," [manas] and consciousness" [vijñāna]
which forms the foundation of all phenomena.

And:

Further, luminosity is nonabiding,
does not cease nor does it arise,
ultimate, the limit of reality.

Here, in order to explain the reality [gnas lugs] of all phenomena, since that which arises from luminosity is a nonconceptual knowing awareness arising (at the same time as a subtle vāyu) from dharmatā, the dhātu of naturally pure luminosity, the mind is the basis of everything [aīaya, kun gzhi]. The mental consciousness [manovijñāna] expands and contracts. Consciousness possesses an eight-fold group.

The foundation of all phenomena is bodhicitta, an unchanging vajra that is equal with space.

This is basically the same thing that Dzogchen is getting at, with the difference that here in this tantra, bodhicitta is defined as the union of the relative and ultimate. Dzogchen however dispenses with the distinction altogether, regarding it as a deviation. An ancient commentary found in the Bairo brgyud 'bum on The Soaring Great Garuda [one of the five earlier extracts translated by Vairocana] explains:

[T]o demonstrate the deviation of madhyamaka: here, since the two truths have been

inseparable from the beginning, the two truths are not presented individually even conventionally. Having divided up the dharmatā and dharmin into relative and ultimate, training in the ultimate as supreme is the deviation of madhyamaka, as it is said: Since phenomena and nonphenomena have always been merged and are inseparable, there is no further need to explain an “ultimate phenomenon”.

Needless to say, the luminosity discussed above is not the luminosity discussed in the completion stage of the Guhyasamaja.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 10th, 2015 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

smcj said:

Uh huh. So what about all that "samsara and nirvana are seen as the same" idea? Why even call it "non-dual" if all there is is a singularity?

Malcolm wrote:

Because there isn't even a singularity.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 10th, 2015 at 1:49 AM

Title: Re: Huang Po's One Mind & Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

We already have such a text, it is called *bsam gtan mig dgron* by Nubchen Sangye Yeshe. The advantage to that text is that it has many citations from seminal early Chan texts already translated into Tibetan by Tibetan and Chinese Chan practitioners during the 8th century.

Astus said:

Is there an English translation already? Although, it certainly has no information on Huangbo.

Malcolm wrote:

No, but the point is that Chan section, for example cites more than forty passages from Chan texts. It has 68 pages alone devoted to the so called *cig car* approach to view, meditation and conduct.

He summarizes the basic difference between Chan and the sutra gradual path as follows:

"From the beginning, the sudden approach is to train on the non-arising ultimate without alternating [with relative truth]."

He then goes on to quote Bodhidharma:

Abandon bias and concepts about the real. If one remains vividly, neither self nor other exists, commoners and āryas are equivalent and the same. If one remains in unchanging stability, from then, on do not follow letters and scriptures. Without concepts, remain in the actual state of the real meaning, peaceful, without activity. That is non-egagement with objects.

He compares and contrasts Chan texts and approaches with Mahāyoga and Atiyoga.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 9th, 2015 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: a few thoughts about Satanism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

"The Devil" is, historically, the God of any people that one personally dislikes..."

-- Aleister Crowley

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 9th, 2015 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Huang Po's One Mind & Dzogchen

Content:

DGA said:

Maybe so, but I think your caution bears repeating. Literary Chinese presents its own challenges and possibilities as a medium for Dharma transmission. Context matters tremendously, so someone attempting a comparative study would need to have a very firm grip on how Huang Po uses this concept throughout his known writings.

Astus said:

Choosing Huangbo is a good start. Now for comparison's sake we also need a single Dzogchen text to work with, one that's been translated a few times to English and contains enough information (e.g. definitions).

Malcolm wrote:

We already have such a text, it is called *bsam gtan mig dgron* by Nubchen Sangye Yeshe. The advantage to that text is that it has many citations from seminal early Chan texts already translated into Tibetan by Tibetan and Chinese Chan practitioners during the 8th century.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 9th, 2015 at 9:56 PM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Astus said:

Emptiness means conditioned, interacting. Sentience is living, connecting with events, phenomena influencing phenomena.

Malcolm wrote:

You mean there is no emptiness of the unconditioned? Emptiness means being free from all extremes, it does not mean being "conditioned." If it did, that would be a very inferior kind of emptiness.

Astus said:

Mind is sentient, perceptive, because impressions, emotions and thoughts move.

Malcolm wrote:

Wind moves, but it is neither sentient nor perceptive. Waves move, they are neither sentient nor perceptive. Clouds move, they are neither sentient nor perceptive. So it seems you definitive of sentient and perceptive because of the movement of thoughts, and so on is inadequate.

Are thoughts the same thing as the mind or are they different? If they are latter, how can a mind move inside of itself? Of they are different, how does their movement give the mind sentience?

Astus said:

If consciousness were unconditioned, it had no effect on anything and could not sense anything, that is, it were insentient.

Malcolm wrote:

Did anyone say consciousness [vijñāna] was unconditioned?

Astus said:

How is consciousness interdependent? Does it come from the sense organ or the object? Without either?

The 18 dhatus is a basic description of how consciousness is interdependent, further elaborations are found in abhidharma and yogacara materials. The mind-stream continues from the preceding mind to the present mind.

Malcolm wrote:

The eighteen dhātus does not actually explain how the mind is interdependent. It is a hinayāna model that assumes that a consciousness arises from the contact of sense object with a sense organ. In other words, it does not explain perception, it merely provides a taxonomy of our sensory apparatus.

Astus said:

Who said anything about an independent knower?

What you called the unconditioned knowing, the core and basis of mind and all appearances. It is unconditioned, therefore independent. It is knowing, what knows, so it is a knower, pure awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

This fault does not apply, just as the mind of which it is the core is not established, also the unconditioned vidyā is not established, is empty by nature and is not something real or truly existent.

Astus said:

This still does not explain the origin of consciousness, that is, how there can be a mind/consciousness at all.

Is there a situation where there is no mind?

Malcolm wrote:

Is there a situation in which the mind can be found?

Astus said:

Can consciousness occur from non-consciousness? Samsara is without a beginning, so is the mind-stream of beings.

Malcolm wrote:

This presumes two things, one, that there is fact a distinction between sentient and nonsentient. Two, it presumes that time exists independently.

Astus said:

Self-originated pristine consciousness is nondual emptiness and knowingness, termed "the nondual dharmadhātu and vidyā." Pristine consciousness [ye shes, jñāna] is the core of the mind, self-arisen, unconditioned, uncontaminated, unaffected by the three times. When it is not recognized, then through that ignorance its potentiality becomes mind, dependent origination and all the phenomena of samsara. When it is recognized, one is the peer of Buddha Samantabhadra.

Since it is unconditioned and unaffected, it cannot recognise or forget itself. So a second perceiver is required that is conditioned, and its core cannot be the unconditioned knowing.

Malcolm wrote:

Since unconditioned self-originated pristine consciousness is the core of a conditioned mind, it indeed can be forgotten by that conditioned mind, or as it more accurately the case, not recognized. It is just like someone who looks for their keys all over the house not recognizing that they are holding those very same keys in their hand.

Emptiness is unconditioned, but we have no problem describing it as the dharmatā of entities. Likewise, unconditioned, empty, self-originated pristine consciousness is the dharmatā of the mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 9th, 2015 at 9:41 PM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The basis appears as the universe under the influence of ignorance.

The universe appears as the basis under the influence of knowledge.

smcj said:

Sounds like you're not going to get away from those pesky images.

Malcolm wrote:

When the universe arise as the basis, there are no referential objects anymore, so how can there be images?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 9th, 2015 at 9:39 PM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

cloudburst said:

It mentions "unconditioned vidya." Does that imply there is a conditioned vidya, or is the author simply being descriptive?

Malcolm wrote:

Sure, the mind that knows and engages conditioned things is has conditioned vidyā.

cloudburst said:

Why is it necessary to say there is a dharmata OF 'the union of clarity and emptiness' aka the dharmata of the mind ? Your formulations seems unnecessarily complicated.

Malcolm wrote:

It is necessary because in this case clarity and emptiness are an indivisible whole; it is not the case that there is a relative side, clarity; and an ultimate side, emptiness — together they form the dharmatā of the mind, hence "the dharmata OF the union of clarity and emptiness."

cloudburst said:

Better to say that the dharmata of the mind is the union of clarity and emptiness. So ... unconditioned vidya is the union of clarity and emptiness. But of course, this union has a conditioned aspect, the clarity or knowingness aspect.

Malcolm wrote:

That is not actually what is being said here. Self-originated jñāna is unconditioned, clear, and empty.

If it is as you say, rig pa would merely be a subtle mind.

A subtle mind is a subtle union of emptiness and clarity. So it would seem there is good reason to state that the vidya of the great perfection is a subtle mind

Only if you are not familiar with the teachings of the Great Perfection.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 9th, 2015 at 5:31 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

cloudburst said:

if it is than it must not be a consciousness

Malcolm wrote:

It is not a mind included among the eight consciousnesses, as explained above already.

cloudburst said:

... but generally I find Hopkins to be the most obfuscatory translator I have ever read, excepting Thurman, of course.

Malcolm wrote:

The substance of it is this:

My contemporary, Jawa Do Ngag, seized on the explanation of others that in the context of the luminosity of the meditation of the isolation of the mind in the Guhyasamāja's Five Stages, original mind means a subtle mind. Beginning from that, he claims, "The vidyā the Great Perfection introduces is a subtle mind. Since that subtle mind is conditioned because it arises from four conditions, the Great Perfection is conditioned." Also there are those who repeat this very inappropriate statement.

In general, since the original mind [gnyug sems, ādyacitta] is the unconditioned luminous nature of the mind, that is also the sugatagarbha, but maintaining that is a conditioned mind is very erroneous. Since the luminosity of the completion stage of the Guhyasamāja is explained to be conditioned, [15/a] if this is the special feature to be revealed, color that however you like. Though I have no wish to express a refutation of that [the completion stage of Guhyasamāja], don't mix that up with the Great Perfection.

It is well known through the Dharma of the tantras, agamas and upadeśas of the Great Perfection, the teachings of Omniscient Longchenpa up to the lineage of gurus of Kama and Terma of the present day that unconditioned vidyā is introduced as the dharmatā of the union of clarity and emptiness.

If it is as you say, rig pa would merely be a subtle mind.

seems like a real possibility

See above.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 9th, 2015 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Self-originated pristine consciousness is nondual emptiness and knowingness, termed "the nondual dharmadhātu and vidyā." Pristine consciousness [ye shes, jñāna] is the core of the mind, self-arisen, unconditioned, uncontaminated, unaffected by the three times. When it is not recognized, then through that ignorance its potentiality becomes mind, dependent origination and all the phenomena of samsara. When it is recognized, one is the peer of Buddha Samantabhadra.

treehuggingoctopus said:

Malcolm,

so we seemingly filthy eternalists are actually not filthy eternalists at all because self-originated pristine consciousness is empty -- even though its emptiness is not the emptiness of Madhyamaka, but experiential emptiness, such as the (nature of) mind's unfindability?

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness of the mind and the knowingness of the mind, called the dharmatā of the mind are ultimate, not relative. Emptiness is indivisible with knowingness, knowingness is indivisible with emptiness. There is no cause or condition for this indivisible empty knowingness that is the dharmatā of the mind. It is completely different than the idea of "the subtle mind" advanced by some Gelugpas who seek to unify the five stages of the Guhyasamaja system with Dzogchen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 9th, 2015 at 4:22 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Only if you are a Gelugpa — ordinary people assume inherent existence, all they assume is existence.

cloudburst said:

Quite wrong, I sense this is one of your core misunderstandings. An inherently existent thing would be a thing that exists by nature, and this is precisely what ordinary people understand by existence, ergo they assume inherent existence, just not as a matter of discourse.

Malcolm wrote:

No one but philosophers engaged in 2nd century Indian philosophical discourse believed in svabhāva.

For ordinary people, bhāva is enough. They were not stupid, they saw things change, come into existence, perish., etc., without believing there was a potness in pots or a cowness in cows.

Self-originated pristine consciousness is nondual emptiness and knowingness, termed "the nondual dharmadhātu and vidyā."
right, non-dual emptiness and awareness, the union of the two truths. Emptiness is the ultimate nature of awareness. Astus is doing a good job.[/quote]

Vidyā [rig pa] is ultimate, not relative; unconditioned, not conditioned; etc. Mipham addresses this issue. You can read about in Fundamental Mind, translated by Hopkins. If it is as you say, rig pa would merely be a subtle mind. Mipham rejects this for many reasons, not only a few. I suggest you read what he says there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 9th, 2015 at 2:45 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

If the dharmatā of the mind is only emptiness, how then is the mind not something inert? How does consciousness arise? From itself? From other? From both? Dependent origination is just the perception of the deluded.

Astus said:

Inert would be something unconditioned and without interaction.

Malcolm wrote:

Astus, "inert" means "without sentience". Emptiness is not sentient. Thus, if emptiness were solely the nature of the mind, the mind could not be sentient.

Astus said:

Consciousness is interdependent, changing, and that's how it can sense objects, how there can be perception.

Malcolm wrote:

How is consciousness interdependent? Does it come from the sense organ or the object? Without either?

Astus said:

An independent knower is without any object, consequently it does not sense anything, it is unknowing, unaware, unconscious.

Malcolm wrote:

Who said anything about an independent knower?

Astus said:

As an interdependent consciousness it does not need an origin, and that origin would mean an ultimate cause without a cause.

Malcolm wrote:

This still does not explain the origin of consciousness, that is, how there can be a mind/consciousness at all.

Astus said:

Also, this original knower is a position discussed in the 9th chapter of MMK. Dependent origination is what the deluded does not realise, instead they assume inherent existence.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if you are a Gelugpa — ordinary people assume inherent existence, all they assume is existence.

Astus said:

How come they don't apply to jnana?

Malcolm wrote:

Great Tantra Clarifying The Meaning of Freedom From Proliferation states:

In the context of explaining the illustrative examples of that basis, it is said to be empty and pervasive like space; immaculate like a crystal; unchanging like a vajra; the source of all blessings like a jewel; unimpeded illumination like the heart of the sun and so on. It is the opposite of ignorance [avidyā] and inertness, existing as nature of a veridical consciousness, it is knowledge [vidyā]. Since it is beyond cause and condition, it is self-originated. Since it does not arise adventitiously, it is the pristine consciousness that has become the nature of the vidyā that has always existed. It is the basis from which all samsara and nirvana appear.

Self-originated pristine consciousness is nondual emptiness and knowingness, termed "the nondual dharmadhātu and vidyā." Pristine consciousness [ye shes, jñāna] is the core of the mind, self-arisen, unconditioned, uncontaminated, unaffected by the three times. When it is not recognized, then through that ignorance its potentiality becomes mind, dependent origination and all the phenomena of samsara. When it is recognized, one is the peer of Buddha Samantabhadra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 9th, 2015 at 1:14 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

smcj said:

That explanation still sounds like "just images on the mirror" still to me.

Malcolm wrote:

There aren't any images on the mirror...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 9th, 2015 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

smcj said:

Dependent origination is just the perception of the deluded.

Because it's all just "images on the mirror"?

Malcolm wrote:

No, because dependent origination starts from not seeing your own state.

Many followers of Dharma perceive dependent origination to be an external fact or law that governs the production of phenomena.

But from a Dzogchen point of view, dependent origination only begins from the phase of ignorance called the imputing ignorance [kun brtags ma rig pa]. Prior to this, there is no dependent origination to speak of. For example, for a buddha who sees things just as they are, there is no dependent origination at all. The Guhyagarbha states:

Buddhas themselves never find

a phenomena other than buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 9th, 2015 at 12:47 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Astus said:

To add a knowing/awareness as the source of the experiencing function of the mind sounds very much like denying the functionality of dependent origination and establishing a substance separately from appearances. How is that not the case?

Malcolm wrote:

If the dharmatā of the mind is only emptiness, how then is the mind not something inert?

How does consciousness arise? From itself? From other? From both?

Dependent origination is just the perception of the deluded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 9th, 2015 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Huang Po's One Mind & Dzogchen

Content:

DGA said:

心 translates the Sanskrit citta, correct? if so, then there's some basis for working out a textual comparison between Dzogchen and Ch'an on the basis of "mind."

Astus said:

I wouldn't go there. Chan is mainly about translating the Dharma to common Chinese and not about transplanting Indian Buddhism, as that's already happened through other channels. Although Chan teachers were (almost?) exclusively educated elite monastics, so references to texts and concepts of Indian origin is not unusual, but it is not the main characteristics of the tradition. There is even a slight division between the so called eight schools to Chinese (Tiantai, Huayan, Chan, Jingtu (Pure Land)) and Indian (Madhyamaka (Sanlun), Yogacara (Faxiang), Vinaya (Lu), Mantra (Zhenyan)), that signifies mostly their origin in a sense.

Xin (心) can mean all sorts of things, even contradictory ones within the same sentence. Or as an illustration for its versatile use, here is the entry from the Soothill-Hodous dictionary of Chinese Buddhism:

心

hrd, hrdaya 汗栗太 (or 汗栗駄); 紀哩駄 the heart, mind, soul; citta 質多 the heart as the seat of thought or intelligence. In both senses the heart is likened to a lotus. There are various definitions, of which the following are six instances: (1) 肉團心 hrd, the physical heart of sentient or nonsentient living beings, e. g. men, trees, etc. (2) 集起心 citta, the ālayavijñāna, or totality of mind, and the source of all mental activity. (3) 思量心 manas, the thinking and calculating mind; (4) 緣慮心; 了別心; 慮知心; citta; the discriminating mind; (5) 堅實心 the bhūtatathatā mind, or the permanent mind; (6) 積聚精要心 the mind essence of the sutras.

Malcolm wrote:

All of these usages map to sems [citta] in Tibetan.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 9th, 2015 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Self-originated jñāna is the unconditioned essence of the eight consciousnesses, as Mipham puts it: [The] unconditioned self-originated wisdom of the original empty knowing dharmatā of the mind of the eight consciousness is the mind of luminosity. However, one needs to take care to understand what this "mind" is. Again, Mipham states: Here, dharmatā is called "original mind [ādyacitta]." Though it is explained with the name mind or vidyā from the aspect of being intrinsically clear, it is not the mind included with the conditioned eight consciousnesses.

Astus said:

All it seems to say is that the eight consciousnesses have the attribute of

consciousness, and that is their inherent quality; and that quality is not any singular instance of being conscious of something, but it is true for all eight, so in a sense it is unconditioned and nothing in particular at the same time. Did I miss something?

Malcolm wrote:

If that were true, it would be a tautology and there would be no point.

It is saying that vijñāna/citta/manas has a dharmatā that is more than emptiness, which would render the dharmatā of the mind inert if all it was is emptiness. According to everything you have said, you maintain that the dharmatā of the mind is only emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 8th, 2015 at 11:53 PM

Title: Re: Tanaka & Robertson on Ch'an vs Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Mipham might say: Since there is nothing to designate as being produced from a cause or generated by condition because the great emptiness that has always been self-originated is intrinsically luminous, it is self-originated pristine consciousness. That is the mind of dharmatā or the luminous pristine consciousness.

Astus said:

"Therefore, thought of the unreal from the outset is calmed, and sense objects from the outset are void. The mind of voidness and calm is a spiritual Knowing that never darkens. This calm Knowing of voidness and calm is precisely the mind of voidness and calm that Bodhidharma formerly transmitted. Whether you are deluded or awakened, mind from the outset is spontaneously Knowing. [Knowing] is not produced by conditions, nor does it arise in dependence on sense objects. Even during delusion the depravities are Knowing, but [Knowing] is not the depravities. Even during awakening the divine transformations are Knowing, but Knowing is not the divine transformations."
(Zongmi: Chan Letter in "Zongmi on Chan", p 88)

Malcolm wrote:

This just says that a mind knows in the same way that a fire is hot. This is more consistent with Mahāmudra presentations of the nature of the mind, where clarity in general is regarded as the characteristic of the mind, while emptiness is regarded as the nature of the mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 8th, 2015 at 5:23 AM

Title: Re: Tanaka & Robertson on Ch'an vs Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Pretty defective buddhanature, I'd say.

Astus said:

What special features would you add?

Question: "What is called Buddha Mind?" Answer: "Mind's having no mark of variation is called Thusness. Mind's unchangeableness is called the Dharma Nature. Mind's not being connected to anything is called liberation. The mind nature's unimpededness is called enlightenment. The mind nature's quiescence is called nirvana."
(Bodhidharma Anthology, p 16)

Malcolm wrote:

Mipham might say:

Since there is nothing to designate as being produced from a cause or generated by condition because the great emptiness that has always been self-originated is intrinsically luminous, it is self-originated pristine consciousness. That is the mind of dharmatā or the luminous pristine consciousness.

The Tantra Gathering The Definitive Meaning Of The Great Perfection states:

Due to the three times existing in the mind,
before, after, and present occur in life.

Due to transmigrating existing in the mind,
therefore, birth and death arise for the body.

Due to various illness, happiness and suffering
being one's mind, it ripens as samsara.

Therefore, the mind is not buddha...

Unrealized confused people
claim "the dharmakāya is my mind."

Therefore, other than the words, they do not understand the meaning.

The one who understands the definitive meaning from names is rare.

Therefore, mind is not buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 8th, 2015 at 5:21 AM

Title: Re: Tanaka & Robertson on Ch'an vs Dzogchen

Content:

Astus said:

Without digressing into philosophical disputes, buddha-nature in Zen is just one's own mind. What is mind? This mind reading and thinking. Thoughts, emotions, impressions come and go. One doesn't have to do anything, as experiences are already ungraspable and naturally non-abiding. In other terms, the mind is free and aware just as it is.

Malcolm wrote:

Pretty defective buddhanature, I'd say.

monktastic said:

Is it different than what Rangjung Dorje says?

The heart-mind of all the Buddhas of the past, the present, and the future, widely renowned as Dharmakaya, as Mahamudra, as enlightened mind, is precisely your own mind, which thinks of this and that.

Malcolm wrote:

If buddhanature is your own mind, which thinks of this and that, then that buddhanature would be conditioned, and thus, defective.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 8th, 2015 at 5:13 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

For you, the dharmatā of the mind is only emptiness. For Mipham, the dharmatā of the mind is unconditioned jñāna.

Astus said:

Is jnana knowing, an active awareness of appearances? Or is it without knowing of objects? If the former, it is conditioned. If the latter, it is unaware. Or is it perhaps the stream of experiences that can be described as equally empty and conscious, but still without falling into being conditioned by subject and object?

Malcolm wrote:

Self-originated jñāna is the unconditioned essence of the eight consciousnesses, as Mipham puts it:

[The] unconditioned self-originated wisdom of the original empty knowing dharmatā of the mind of the eight consciousness is the mind of luminosity.

However, one needs to take care to understand what this "mind" is. Again, Mipham states:

Here, dharmatā is called "original mind [ādyacitta]." Though it is explained with the name mind or vidyā from the aspect of being intrinsically clear, it is not the mind included with the conditioned eight consciousnesses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 8th, 2015 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: Tanaka & Robertson on Ch'an vs Dzogchen

Content:

Astus said:

Without digressing into philosophical disputes, buddha-nature in Zen is just one's own mind. What is mind? This mind reading and thinking. Thoughts, emotions, impressions come and go. One doesn't have to do anything, as experiences are already ungraspable and naturally non-abiding. In other terms, the mind is free and aware just as it is.

Malcolm wrote:
Pretty defective buddhanature, I'd say.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, December 8th, 2015 at 4:22 AM
Title: Re: question on the types of blessing pills
Content:
pemachophel said:
Loppon,

Are you saying dudtshi doesn't have a liberation through taste function? That would seem to contradict a number of my Teachers.

Malcolm wrote:
Myong grol is one thing, bdud rtsi is another. For example, the Sakyapas have bdud rtsi pills for the inner offering, but they do not have myong grol.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, December 8th, 2015 at 3:10 AM
Title: Re: Dzogchen master's perspective [from The Sacred...]
Content:
Vasana said:
but you really are in the direct presence of Samantabhardas enlightened intent when reading and abiding with this text.

Malcolm wrote:
No, one is not, despite the hyperbole which may lead one to think so.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, December 8th, 2015 at 1:19 AM
Title: Re: Madhyamika & Yogacara: Which Was Popular First?
Content:
Boomerang said:
I've heard people say that Yogacara used to be the most popular philosophy, and then people switched over to Madhyamika. Seeing as Nagarjuna lived a few hundred years before Asanga, how did this switch come about? Was Madhyamika not popular when Nagarjuna was alive, or did the popular preference go back and forth between Madhyamika and Yogacara?

Malcolm wrote:
Madhyamaka first, then Yogacara.

M

Boomerang said:

But now in Tibetan Buddhism Madhyamaka takes the center stage, doesn't it? So it did go full circle?

Malcolm wrote:

No, Madhyamaka was always dominant in India, Yogacara was studied for its presentation of the path, Madhyamaka was studied for the definitive view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 8th, 2015 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: Madhyamika & Yogacara: Which Was Popular First?

Content:

Boomerang said:

I've heard people say that Yogacara used to be the most popular philosophy, and then people switched over to Madhyamika. Seeing as Nagarjuna lived a few hundred years before Asanga, how did this switch come about? Was Madhyamika not popular when Nagarjuna was alive, or did the popular preference go back and forth between Madhyamika and Yogacara?

Malcolm wrote:

Madhyamaka first, then Yogacara.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 8th, 2015 at 12:36 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Anders said:

This might be a can of worms, but are you effectively saying Vasubandhu et al were not aryas?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no way for me to know this as there is no way for me to know what their actual view and realization was.

Astus said:

Nevertheless, if they taught an incoherent and incorrect teaching, that is intentionally misleading people, something that's unfit for any bodhisattva.

Malcolm wrote:

I see no reason to suspect their motives, but it is pretty clear that Madhyamakas, including Shantarakshita, found the Yogacara explanations of mind-only to be riddled with realist presumptions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 8th, 2015 at 12:33 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.

Malcolm wrote:

It is an incoherent account of causality, unlike dependent origination.

Astus said:

Because that is how they attempt to explain the meaning of mind-only.

It's not even mentioned in the Vimsatika that talks about consciousness only.

Malcolm wrote:

This is not exactly true, since the subject of Vimsatika is principally an explanation of the imagined nature. The three natures are discussed at length by Vasubandhu in the Trisvabhāvanirdeśa.

Astus said:

Yes, and for this reason, you don't really get the sense of Dzogchen. Mipham writes: Do you mean that Dzogchen posits a consciousness of the type that's independent, unconditioned, removed from the five aggregates? If yes, it's difficult to maintain how that's not like an atman. If no, then I see no difference between what I said and what Mipham talks about.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

For you, the dharmatā of the mind is only emptiness. For Mipham, the dharmatā of the mind is unconditioned jñāna.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 8th, 2015 at 12:04 AM

Title: Re: question on the types of blessing pills

Content:

pemachophel said:

Chulen is for the practice of rasayana, rejuvenation, health, and longevity and also forms a part of the completion stage practice of going beyond physical sustenance.

Dudtsi/men/jinlob is for liberation by taste. Although it contains many healing medicinals and one of its names is men /"medicine", it's spiritual power is pre-eminent. It contains many things besides herbs and minerals, including many, many sacred substances. It is used as an inner offering (as in the men of me-rak). It is also what physically consecrates the amrit in the kapala at a tshog. It is also used to consecrate "permanent" tormas and is also an essential ingredient in consecrating statues. It is also taken just before or at the time of death when all life-saving medicine is useless. The virtues of dudtsi/men are truly various and wonderful!

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, Dudtsi is for the inner offering;

myong grol, liberation through taste, does not exist outside of Dzogchen tantras.

People often conflate the two, but they are not actually the same thing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 7th, 2015 at 11:35 PM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Mother's Lap said:

On this note, is it possible for sutra practitioners that hold to eternalist/substantialist views, such as those of Yogacara, to become Aryas and still hold those views post-attaining the first bhumi?

Malcolm wrote:

No. It is not possible.

Anders said:

This might be a can of worms, but are you effectively saying Vasubandhu et al were not aryas?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no way for me to know this as there is no way for me to know what their actual view and realization was.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 7th, 2015 at 11:31 PM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sure there are.

Astus said:

Just as Madhyamaka affirms a conventional dependent origination and does not claim

total non-existence, the same is stated by saying that there is a dependent nature.

Malcolm wrote:

Unlike Yogacara, Madhyamaka removes claims for existing existents.

Astus said:

Candrakirti's critique does not apply, when it is understood that the lack of subject and object means the incorrect reification is no more, otherwise it would be self-defeating, asking for a self to perceive no-self.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it applies — he proves that the other-dependent is incoherent.

Astus said:

Yogachara and Madhyamaka did not "come together" in Shantarakshita because the latter never uses the scheme of the three own natures, which is the key doctrine of the Yogacara school.

Why is that the key doctrine? They also have quite a few other unique ideas. I'd say the teaching of mind only is an equally important teaching for instance.

Malcolm wrote:

Because that is how they attempt to explain the meaning of mind-only.

Astus said:

What is the difference? Or if you have a book reference, that might be enough as well.

Malcolm wrote:

In brief, MAV merely state that the absence of the imagined in the dependent is the perfected.

gZhan stong pas by contrast try to map the three natures onto the two truths, thereby distorting both doctrines, claiming that perfected nature [ultimate] is empty of both the imagined and the dependent [relative].

Astus said:

What Tibetan term do you mean for awareness? Rig pa?

Malcolm wrote:

It's nothing like that. You can change that word to consciousness or mind. What I try to highlight is that the quality of consciousness/awareness is already and necessarily present in the mind (mental aggregates), and generally in the whole realm of experience, since without being aware/conscious of something, one cannot say that it is experienced.[/quote]

Yes, and for this reason, you don't really get the sense of Dzogchen. Mipham writes:

[The] meaning explained by the term, “Great Perfection, the luminous mind essence” is the dharmatā of the mind, self-originated pristine consciousness, nothing other than the dharmadhātu, the reality of the original basis, and the total uniformity of union. Since it does not change with the three times, it is totally unconditioned, but there is no chance for there to arise here the subject, a momentary impermanent conditioned mind, and the unreal sole emptiness that is a mere object to refute by reasoning. Therefore, the Great Perfection of the basis or this totally unconditioned union of the luminosity of the basis, is the ultimate reality of all phenomena.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 7th, 2015 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Astus said:

As long as you think the unconditioned nature of the mind is merely emptiness, for that long you will never understand either Dzogchen or Mahāmudra.

Mind, per definition, is conscious. To say that the mind is empty is to say that awareness is empty. It's not denying awareness, nor is it reducing it to insentience. Awareness is the interdependent stream of experiences, and it is not separate from its insubstantiality. Mind is conditioned, that's why it is without essence, otherwise it would not function at all. So being conditioned is the unconditioned, and unconditioned is the conditioned itself. How is that wrong for Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

What Tibetan term do you mean for awareness? Rig pa?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, December 7th, 2015 at 12:30 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Astus said:

In the basic works of Asanga and Vasubandhu there is no attack against Nagarjuna's teachings...

Malcolm wrote:

Sure there are. Take for example, the Summary of the Great Vehicle [BDK edition], chapter 2, section 25. states "Since the other-dependent does not really exist as it appears, how does one know that it is not entirely nonexistent? If there were no other-dependent pattern, the reality pattern would also be nonexistent and then one would come to affirm universal nothingness. And then, if the other-dependent pattern both did not exist, one would fall into the error about the being and nonbeing of defilement and purification. But since these states can be known not to be nothing, it is not true that all

is nothing." [pg. 51]

Candrakirti's rebuttal to this is quite famous between MAV 6.72...

If there is an entity such as the dependent, empty of duality
lacking apprehended objects, devoid of an apprehending subject,
by whom is the existence of this entity known?

It is not reasonable says that which cannot be apprehended "exists."

...

If there exists such an entity as the other-dependent nature
that is nonarisen and unknowable,
the existence of this cannot be known by anyone,
like the harm caused by the son of a barren women to others.

When the other-dependent does not exist at all,
what can be a cause of the relative [in your system]?
On the other hand, the presentation
which is known to the world is is destroyed.

Astus said:

While there were people in the later centuries who thought in terms of opposing views,
there were others who could put the two into a single system.

Malcolm wrote:

For example? Who did do you gave in mind? If you gave in mind Shatnarakshita, he never
uses the scheme of the three natures. If you have in mind Ratnakarashanti, he destroys
the distinction between the two truths in his attempt to harmonize the two systems and
never escapes the fundamental inner contradiction found in the Yogacara presentation
of the three natures.

Astus said:

Just as the dependent is the ultimate without the imagined, so is seeing the
inseparability of interdependence and emptiness, the conventional and the ultimate, is
called the middle way. Not reifying appearances is seeing their dependent-empty nature
for both Yogacara and Madhyamaka.

Malcolm wrote:

This reasoning is destroyed by Candrakirti.

Astus said:

Regarding their differences, Yijing's summary (quoted by Malcolm David Eckel in his
"Bhavaviveka and His Buddhist Opponents", p 95; and "Undigested Pride" in
"Madhyamaka and Yogacara - Allies or Rivals?", p 133) sounds nice and succinct: "For
Yogacara ultimate (真) is (有), conventional (俗) isn't (無). They use the three natures as
the foundation. For Madhyamaka ultimate isn't, conventional is. Indeed the two truths is

primary [for them]. The Prajnaparamita's great teaching contains both ideas."
(T40n1817p783a29-b1)

Malcolm wrote:

Eckel is a nice guy. I remember being in his office one day where he confided in me he was much relieved that he was not a Buddhist. So...

Astus said:

their coming together in the teachings of for instance Shantarakshita and Kamalashila.

Malcolm wrote:

Yogachara and Madhyamaka did not "come together" in Shantarakshita because the latter never uses the scheme of the three own natures, which is the key doctrine of the Yogacara school.

Astus said:

Please give us a specific example of how Yogacara doxology influences Vajrayāna? You surely are aware that Tantras such as the Hevajra subordinate Yogacara to Madhyamaka? And are you sure that it is not merely a case of Madhyamakas using terminology found in Yogacara but repurposing it?

Malcolm wrote:

Look at this thread as an example:

<http://dharma.wheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=100&t=13491>.

Astus said:

There's also the whole Shentong teaching among Nyingmapas and Kagyupas, of which Brunnholzl writes: "what is called Shentong is nothing other than the Yogacara (Yoga Practice) system of Maitreya, Asanga, and Vasubandhu, also called "the lineage of vast activity."" (Center of the Sunlit Sky, p 445)

Malcolm wrote:

No, even Karl B recognizes that the system of the three own natures used by Maitreya, Asanga and Vasubandhu [type a] is not the system used by the gzhan stong pas [type b].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 10:20 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Malcolm 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: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 10:19 AM
Title: Re: LSD
Content:
dzogchungpa said:
This thread is tripping.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 10:17 AM
Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen
Content:
Mother's Lap said:
On this note, is it possible for sutra practitioners that hold to eternalist/substantialist views, such as those of Yogacara, to become Aryas and still hold those views post-attaining the first bhumi?

Malcolm wrote:
No. It is not possible.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 9:45 AM
Title: Re: Theravadin looking for a bit of suggestion
Content:
Astus said:
Unless Dzogchen posits something beyond the possible realm of experience (body-mind), the difference you mention is non-existent.

Malcolm wrote:
As long as you think the unconditioned nature of the mind is merely emptiness, for that long you will never understand either Dzogchen or Mahāmudra.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 9:43 AM
Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
With respect to the Yogacara school, they do indeed posit an ultimate consciousness — it is the meaning of line of Madhyantavibhaga, "The imagination of the unreal exists..." and so on, though I understand it is fashionable these days to try and rescue Yogacara from being hoisted on its own petard.

Astus said:
As I read it, the Madhyantavibhaga there says nothing different from what Nagarjuna writes about the equality between dependent origination and emptiness. It is also

repeated in how the three natures are explained. If that means Yogacara is at fault, then so is Madhyamaka.

Malcolm wrote:

The Madhyantavibhaga is basically asserting that the perfect is the absence of the imagined in the dependent. The dependent however is never refuted. It is the emptiness that exists in which no duality exists.

Frankly, I am a little surprised that you don't understand the difference between Madhyamaka and Yogacara. Yogacarins and Madhyamakas in India certainly understood the differences between their respective schools, and there is an extensive polemical literature which exists between them detailing the differences.

Astus said:

That's quite a huge point, putting Yogacara into the position of not only a less developed view, but actually means that they massively failed in setting up a coherent system.

Malcolm wrote:

There are indeed some glaring internal contradictions in the Yogacara system of Maitreya, Asanga, Vasubandhu and their followers. For example, Arya Vimuktisena directly take his teacher, Vasubandhu, to task for some of those inconsistencies.

Astus said:

Then it is certainly strange how Yogacara has such a big influence on virtually every Mahayana (incl. Vajrayana) school. So, I'm still doubtful about that interpretation's validity.

Malcolm wrote:

Please give us a specific example of how Yogacara doxology influences Vajrayāna? You surely are aware that Tantras such as the Hevajra subordinate Yogacara to Madhyamaka? And are you sure that it is not merely a case of Madhyamakas using terminology found in Yogacara but repurposing it?

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 9:23 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You just took a drug.

Odysseus said:

No, "you" didn't. You rather took an overdose of Cosmic medicine, but you were reckless in your evaluation beforehand.

Malcolm wrote:
Huh?

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 6:26 AM
Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?
Content:
Herbie said:

This is a typical linguistic game. First he lists statements that he wants to suggest as relevant for the term "arising". But why should these be relevant for arising? These are totally irrelevant for the fact that the term arising is a term of conventional language.

Malcolm wrote:
Every negation you find in Nāgārjuna is based on a metaphysical position that someone actually held either in a Buddhist school or a non-Buddhist school. The Sāṃkhya school, as well as some Buddhist schools [Sarvastivāda] actually did assert that existent causes create existent effects. Other schools maintained that existent effects are produced from causes that no longer exist, and so on.

Herbie said:
So instead of delivering a definition for "arising" or the different connotations of the term "arising" which can be found in dictionaries he plays one of his silly games.

Malcolm wrote:
You are acquainted with dictionaries and semantics of 2nd century classical Sanskrit? You are quite certain that Nāgārjuna is not writing for a milieu in which the nuances of the term "jati," arising, etc., are well known?

Herbie said:
Everybody knows that "arising" is a developmental process.

Malcolm wrote:
You are assuming a lot for "everyone", particularly since the context we are discussing is 2nd century India.

How is "arising" a developmental process? When does something make the transition from being a nonexistent to being an existent? How does that process come about? What are the components of that process?

Herbie said:
As a whole the verse is irrational and the question makes it even worse.

Malcolm wrote:
Since you refuse to give credit to the context in which Nāgārjuna's treatise was composed, the only one irrational here is you, much like Humpty Dumpty in Through the Looking Glass.

Herbie said:

His opening statements are just meant to confuse readers.

Malcolm wrote:

They obviously confuse you, but instead of taking the time to understand them, you react to them with bilious irrationality. It really appears that you have only a superficial acquaintance with the subject matter and are totally ill-equipped to carry out a reasoned discussion of it. You cannot even address a single point that in Nāgārjuna's writings other than claiming that this and that is irrational. You seem totally incapable of a rational analysis of Nāgārjuna.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 2:54 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

whatever is known to exist according to worldly convention, the Buddha states that exists. Whatever is known to not exist according to worldly convention, the Buddha states that does not exist.

This is not a position that Nāgārjuna is setting forth. He is merely reporting the four alternatives the Buddha provided in different contexts to different students for different reasons.

Sorry but you cannot explain away the irrationality of this linguistic expression.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not something which is meant to be taken literally. In other words, you think it means that Nāgārjuna is claiming the Buddha said that everything is simultaneously real, unreal, both and neither. If that is what he meant, I would agree with you that such a statement would be irrational gibberish.

Fortunately, there is plenty of evidence to show this is not what Nāgārjuna meant.

Buddhapalita explains that what is meant by this statement is that whatever is known to exist according to worldly convention, the Buddha states that exists. Whatever is known to not exist according to worldly convention, the Buddha states that does not exist.

Whatever is known to be true according to worldly convention, the Buddha states that is true. Whatever is known to be false according to worldly convention, the Buddha states that is false.

Whatever is stated to be true and false in worldly convention the Buddha states that is true and false. Buddhapalita gives the following example: two men who go into a temple have a dispute about the murals in the temple; one man wrongly claims that Vishnu holds a trident and Shiva holds a wheel. The other man correctly claims Shiva holds a trident and Vishnu holds a wheel. Thus in this case the Buddha in accordance with

worldly convention will disagree with the former and agree with the latter.

And finally, as example of the last, there is one man outside who says to them both, you are neither right nor wrong, those are paintings, and so according to mundane convention, the claim of former man is not true and neither is the claim of the latter man. Both of their claims are false since Shiva and Vishnu are not present in the temple at all.

Buddhapalita continues by saying that the Buddha, who sees the emptiness of all things, can say "this is true; this is not true; this is both; this is neither" and so on in accordance with worldly conventions.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 2:26 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

MiphamFan said:

I wasn't aiming at you specifically Malcolm, just wanted to point out that DMT/ayahuasca isn't particularly intense either, at least not in my experience.

Malcolm wrote:

You just took a drug. It is not the same at all as a properly done ayahuasca ceremony with mestizo shamans in the Amazon, which involves fasting, special diet, etc.

You would have had more fun on acid. Or Peyote.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

smcj said:

Irrational because the laws of logic are not followed: identity, non-contradiction, exclusion of the middle

Au contraire.

Herbie said:

Aha ... and what about that?

xviii.8

Everything is real and not real,

Both real and not real,

Neither real nor not real.

The is the Lord Buddha's teaching.

Malcolm wrote:

Here, Nāgārjuna is merely reporting four different kinds of statements to Buddha made with regard to all phenomena. In one place the Buddha said they were real; in another place he said they were unreal; in still another he said they were both; and in a fourth place he said they were neither.

This is not a position that Nāgārjuna is setting forth. He is merely reporting the four alternatives the Buddha provided in different contexts to different students for different reasons.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 2:15 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

[

What? That I said that his tetralemma is irrational? Well it is. If you prefer to call it rational then we do not share a convention as to the division rational vs irrational.

Malcolm wrote:

What is irrational about it, and which tetralemma do you mean?

Herbie said:

you can take any of his.

Irrational because the laws of logic are not followed: identity, non-contradiction, exclusion of the middle

Malcolm wrote:

This would only be true if the tetralemma were a position that Nāgārjuna holds, rather than a series of negations he uses.

For example, he says:

An existent does not arise from an existent;

an existent does not arise from a nonexistent;

a nonexistent does not arise from an existent;

a nonexistent does not arise from a nonexistent;

where can there be arising?

There is nothing irrational about these four negations — and they certainly are not a position.

So, thus far, you have claimed Nāgārjuna is irrational, but you certainly have not shown that this is so by taking a given statement of his apart and showing where it violates the principles you mention above. Until you make the effort, it is impossible to take you seriously.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 1:21 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

MiphamFan said:

I never tried LSD, but after trying pharmahuasca, honestly I was rather underwhelmed.

While on it I just had disorientated motor control and had some slight visual phenomena, but it's nothing mind-blowing, nothing that changed my universe or life or whatever.

It doesn't compare to meditation at all.

I think the youth of today have more than enough distractions leading them in different directions (games, internet, youtube videos, blogs, etc) that the risk of "a stubborn attachment to the nonplasticity of their mental continuum" is fairly minimal. There is a greater danger in being too distracted.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, not recommending anyone take entheogens, just saying it should not be demonized.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 1:12 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The idea svasamvedana takes itself as an object is an problematic conclusion. There is not much evidence that this is what the term means in those systems that use it.

PD4U said:

That's what I said: it makes it circular (a sword that cuts itself) and it leads to an infinite regression (what part of the mind takes the part of the mind that takes itself as object, as object... ad infinitum)

Malcolm wrote:

I guess I am not making my self clear. Let me try again. The systems that use the term rang rig do not use it to mean that that mind takes itself as an object. They use it only to prove that a mind is inherently knowing — in other words, that a mind does not become knowing because it arises as a result of a sense organ meeting an object.

PD4U said:

To prove? It is to show it is not (dual) consciousness, but a primordial (non dual) awareness.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, to prove. We are talking about Yogacara and Pramana here.

PD4U said:

It is not gross mind, but subtle mind. It is not mind, but nature mind. It is not cognitive but experiential. That's the point, as I see it.

Malcolm wrote:

You keep conflating rang rig (svasaṃvedana) with so sor rang gi rig pa'i ye shes (pratyatmyavedana jñāna)

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You don't have to believe me, but you might want to believe his wife — here is just one occasion.

https://books.google.com/books?id=ec8-HH-hxwkC&pg=PA419&lpg=PA419&dq=trungpa+LSD&source=bl&ots=Kkt4dP1JHU&sig=F1nNbsIEACnCa84_Z8UNXTnGinM&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjK1dCrIcXJAhUEqx4KHe4eBXw4ChDoAQgrMAM#v=onepage&q=LSD&f=false

kirtu said:

And if you read that, you would see that Trungpa was trying to save Thomas Rich from his entrenched fixations.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think that was what prompted their little acid party.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 1:07 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

kirtu said:

All poison is also medicine for something.

Malcolm wrote:

LSD has no known toxicity level. However, overdose levels are considered to be in the

1000 to 7000 microgram amount, that is ten to seventy times the standard 100 microgram dosage. It is also completely nonaddictive.

Psilocybin has a very low toxicity rating. A one hundred and thirty pound person would have to eat 37 pounds of *Psilocybe cubensis* mushrooms for the dose to be fatal, i.e., about 6 grams. The effective dose of Psilocybin for such a person is 6 milligrams.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 12:50 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

[

What? That I said that his tetralemma is irrational? Well it is. If you prefer to call it rational then we do not share a convention as to the division rational vs irrational.

Malcolm wrote:

What is irrational about it, and which tetralemma do you mean?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 12:48 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

smcj said:

Whatever the relative potential spiritual merits there may be to psychedelics, there's nothing ambiguous about the effects of sustained exposure to crack and meth. It ends up only in one place. If you want to know what it's like to be demonically possessed, go ahead and get addicted.

Malcolm wrote:

Were we talking about cocaine and meth?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 12:47 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Trungpa did a lot of acid and frequently gave it to his students.

odysseus said:

I don't believe you, it's only an urban legend to dirtify him... lol

Malcolm wrote:

You don't have to believe me, but you might want to believe his wife — here is just one occasion.

https://books.google.com/books?id=ec8-HH-hxwkC&pg=PA419&lpg=PA419&dq=trungpa+LSD&source=bl&ots=Kkt4dP1JHU&sig=F1nNbslEACnCa84_Z8UNXTnGinM&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjK1dCrlcXJAhUEqx4KHe4eBXw4ChDoAQgrMAM#v=onepage&q=LSD&f=false

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 12:38 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

kirtu said:

Yes. I can't prove it but when HHPR told an audience the Nyingma legend of tobacco wherein a dying demoness vows to be reborn as substances in order to make war against Dharma and virtue, it made sense.

Malcolm wrote:

Tobacco was introduced to Tibet in the 17th century.

Tobacco is not a result of the menstrual blood of an evil demoness, it is nice story for religious propaganda purposes

It is a sacred plant to the First People in the Americas, all over the Americas. I personally do not use it, but I don't demonize it either. And in the US, I would put real native tobacco in a sang offering, no problem.

Me

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 12:28 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

kirtu said:

Obviously. But Americans and other westerners in particular seem to have a false narrative that drugs "will save them". In part this may be from Huxley or he may only have been documenting the tendency.

Malcolm wrote:

It cannot be denied that taking psychedelics have radically changed the course of people's lives, mostly for the better. There were studies being conducted on the whether or not LSD, etc., increased empathy or not. Unfortunately, those studies were shuttered. The fact is that I have known hundreds of people who have taken these kinds of drugs, many Buddhists in fact, and none of them reported any long term ill effects, and often

they report long standing confirmations of their insights gained through use of psychedelics with their subsequent Buddhist practice. Virtually everyone I know in my generation who is a Buddhist began their spiritual journey through the Psychedelic movement. Also that is where I started. LSD, rock and roll, etc. I first dropped acid when I was 13. Never regretted it.

kirtu said:

It's his error but it can be a problem for the Dharma transmission to the west (he is not well known, BTW).

Malcolm wrote:

I doubt it. As far as I know, there is no LSD tantra.

That said, there have been people using psychedelics for spiritual purposes in all kinds of cultures all over the world for thousands of years. Is it Dharma? No. Is it spiritually invalid? No.

kirtu said:

When administered in a safe, controlled environment, there is nothing to fear....
Now you switch this to therapeutically controlled usage.

Malcolm wrote:

I mentioned this at the outset.

kirtu said:

Nonetheless as seeker242 above noted there is really no point for spiritual insight (the person I referred to above advocating LSD usage insists in fact that LSD usage promotes insight

Malcolm wrote:

There can be advantages for some people in terms of spiritual insight with use of psychedelics. For example, Garab Dorje mentions that for those who have a stubborn attachment to the nonplasticity of their mental continuums, it can be very useful to take psychedelic substances in order to break their attachment to the mind being something fixed and permanent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, December 6th, 2015 at 12:00 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

PD4U said:

Svasamvedana is often translated as "reflexive awareness" or "selfawareness", and -as you say- that awareness does not depend on an external object but takes itself as object. So it is a dual consciousness.

Malcolm wrote:

The idea svasaṃvedana takes itself as an object is an problematic conclusion. There is not much evidence that this is what the term means in those systems that use it.

Instead, the term is used to prove that consciousness is not inert. The

Śrīguhyasamājālaṃkāra states:

Consciousness arises contrary to
an insentient nature;
that whose nature is not insentient
that alone is intrinsically knowing [rang rig].

PD4U said:

But the point is that "so so rang rig pa'i ye shes" is a non dual awareness and not a (dual) consciousness. If it would be a consciousness then "rang rig" would be circular (a sword that cuts itself) and lead to an infinite regression.

Malcolm wrote:

So sor rang gi rig pa simple means "known for oneself", that's all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 10:36 PM

Title: Re: help please - what to expect from none Buddhist partners

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

The only way to have a comfortable, stable and satisfying relationship is to give up on the wish for the your partner to make you happy and to focus on their happiness instead. The more you love them and try to make them happy, the happier you will be and your relationship will be more likely to last.

Malcolm wrote:

What if making them happier means giving up the Dharma?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 10:23 PM

Title: Re: Theravadin looking for a bit of suggestion

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

Does the difference boil down to the dharmata being understood differently in Ch'an and Vajrayana/Dzogchen?

If so, how are their understandings different?

Thanks.

Malcolm wrote:

In sūtra there we only talk about dharmatā śūnyatā; in Dzogchen we also talk about dharmatā vidyā. In other words the mind is not just something that is empty, like a rock or stone. The reason there is a difference is because minds also have clarity in addition to emptiness. Mipham discusses this issue at length in his Original Mind, translated by Hopkins as " Fundamental Mind."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 10:18 PM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

kirtu said:

LSD experience can just be attached to and this will harm your practice.

Malcolm wrote:

Anything can be attached to...

kirtu said:

I know a person who actually acts as a teacher and advocates LSD drug use (he is in his late 60's/early 70's and he does identify with the former so-called Counterculture). He further grasps at spiritual experiences. However he firmly believes that people are incapable of going beyond mere attachment to materiality without LSD experience.

Malcolm wrote:

That is his problem and his error.

kirtu said:

There's a lot wrong here and there are apparently many people like him (one of my Zen/Seon teachers admitted to starting out like this).

So physically there may be little harm. However there are still physical dangers as people can apparently react in many different ways to these kinds of drugs.

Malcolm wrote:

When administered in a safe, controlled environment, there is nothing to fear. As I said, there is increasing evidence that psilocybin, for example, can help memory loss, PTSD, etc., by regenerating brain cells. I am not saying anyone should take these drugs, I am saying however, that there is no reason to be hysterical or judgmental about it. There are much worse things in life than LSD, like assault rifles.

kirtu said:

I trust Trungpa on this who says that taking LSD is "double samsara" (but from his description he meant to say LSD is samsara squared).

Malcolm wrote:

Trungpa did a lot of acid and frequently gave it to his students.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 9:48 PM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Astus said:

The reason I brought that citation is to show that the difference between knowing and unknowing lies in the presence or absence of dual vision. Self-awareness is another matter.

Malcolm wrote:

The term *svasaṃvedana* does not mean "self-aware," it means that knowing is an intrinsic capacity for the mind to does not depend on an external object, in contradistinction to the Vaibhashika and Sautrantika contention that an instance of knowing depends on an object and a sense organ to arise.

With respect to the Yogacara school, they do indeed posit an ultimate consciousness — it is the meaning of line of Madhyantavibhaga, "The imagination of the unreal exists..." and so on, though I understand it is fashionable these days to try and rescue Yogacara from being hoisted on its own petard.

Astus said:

That would mean that they still maintain a real subject, contradicting themselves.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that is the whole point.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 1:12 PM

Title: Re: Robert Thurman

Content:

dreambow said:

Listening to Robert Thurman, man can he talk! He was discussing Shankaracharya and Nagarjuna and basically said there's no real difference between Shankara's non dualism and Nagarjuna's teachings on sunyata 'emptiness,' they are pretty much saying the same thing.

Malcolm wrote:

He can talk, but he is wrong...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 12:28 PM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

it is an irrational position.

Malcolm wrote:

The tetralemma is not a position, it is an analysis of positions [held by others].

Herbie said:

linguistically existent and not ultimately existent

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, so you are a follower of Tsongkhapa. Figures.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 9:05 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

Let me tell you about the rational tetralemma:

- 1) linguistically existent and ultimately existent
- 2) not linguistically existent and not ultimately existent
- 3) linguistically existent and not ultimately existent
- 4) not linguistically existent and ultimately existent

Now one of these options must be valid and more than one option cannot be valid.

Malcolm wrote:

You did not define what you mean by "linguistically existent" and "ultimately existent."

You also introduce yet another unsupported assertion, viz, "one of these options must be valid and more than one option cannot be valid."

Your assertion is that one of these options must be valid. So, which one are you choosing?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 9:00 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

smcj said:

But in any case Nagarjuna wasn't into that way of thinking. He arrives at his tetralemma

through logic and language. The validity of both is accepted as a given.

Herbie said:

No. His tetralemma is sheer irrationality, the negation of logic.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is actually a systematic refutation of positions other people held. Some people hold a position of existence; others, non-existence; still others both; and still others, neither.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 6:20 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

This is funny. All traditionalists seek refuge in sense perception of the five (not six) senses (seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching) to base their exposition of conventional truths on. However they completely ignore their linguistic truths not based on sense perceptions of the five senses which clearly dominate their system of thought and therefore their linguistic system.

Malcolm wrote:

In fact, a truth is a cognition. That's all. It is either veridical or non-veridical. A conventional truth is a common sense perception [one moon in the sky].

Linguistic truths, as you call them, are not what Madhyamaka is concerned with at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 6:17 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

yeah, demonstrable in writings that accept the mere linguistic truths as convention.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not the case. You really do not understand Madhyamaka at all.

Herbie said:

My concern is intellectual honesty

Malcolm wrote:

Well, so far all you have been is dishonest, so I find it hard to believe you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 6:00 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Astus said:

they hold that as truly existent

I don't see that accusation valid, at least not against Vasubandhu.

Malcolm wrote:

it is definitely valid

Astus said:

Dzogchen: "empty knowing dharmatā of the mind of the eight consciousness"

Yogacara: "empty intrinsically knowing pristine consciousness"

Both sound to me like a non-abiding mind.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the second is svasamvedana [rang rig] that is merely empty of subject and object, but truly exists -- standard Yogacara.

Astus said:

Also,

"What is the difference between ordinary wisdom, which arises from a mind endowed with subject/object grasping, and individually selfcognizant wisdom?"

Malcolm wrote:

This latter term "individually selfcognizant wisdom" is incorrectly translated. The term is so sor rang gi rig pa'i ye shes or pratyatmyavedanañāna.

There is an important citation in the Inlaid Jewels Tantra that clarifies the difference between these two:

Untainted vidyā is the kāya of pristine consciousness.

Since intrinsic knowing [rang rig, svasamvedana] is devoid of actual signs of awakening, it is not at all the pristine consciousness of vidyā [rig pa'i ye shes].

You should read this:

<http://blogs.dickinson.edu/buddhistethics/files/2010/04/kapstein001.pdf>

Might I suggest that if you are going to argue about Tibetan traditions, you do so on the basis of understanding Tibetan and the etymologies of Sanskrit terms in Tibetan?

One of the reasons you rarely see me in Zen or Chinese Buddhism discussions is that I have no expertise in those languages, and I really cannot check any translations I might be using.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 5:52 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

smcj said:

Animals believe is subjective "self" and objective "other" without language.

Herbie said:

First, to make claims about a species one does not belong to is by its nature extremely speculative.

Then, next, designators are not absolutely dependent on language because "imputation" stands for a psycho-mental event (designator) being imputed to another psycho-mental event.

Malcolm wrote:

You are not even in the same area as Nāgārjuna's concerns. At this point, your comments are off topic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 5:46 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

I know that in buddhist linguistic system the term "mind" usually is preferred. In science based system one often chooses "brain" instead. In contrast to "mind" "brain" is based on a visual sense impression independent of belief but only dependent on correct application of a term of conventional language. From the perspective of the two truths, both mind and brain do not exist through the power of their own characteristics but through the power of imputation.

Malcolm wrote:

Why would this be from the perspective of the two truths? What does ultimate truth [a veridical object of cognition] have to do with this?

Herbie said:

Everything I write is a linguistic truth and it can only become a conventional truth for you if you agree with the linguistic expression I am applying.

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, this is what you do not understand about Madhyamaka. Madhyamaka is not about linguistic assignments. It is about shared perceptions which are then, only after the fact, given labels.

For example, we have human eyes, we see the same sets of colors because humans have evolved to see a certain range of light on the electromagnetic scale [we

can regard this as self-evident].

My and your ability to see red, yellow and blue is not predicated on our having words for these colors before we see them. It is only after we see them, and come together, that we have together given them linguistic designations. "Truths" are defined in Madhyamaka as perceptions, not linguistic designations.

"given percept", "the objects of deluded cognitions", "the percept" are your linguistic truths. I do not think that we share a convention as to these linguistic expressions. These are not mere "linguistic" truths -- these facts are demonstrable in Madhyamaka writings. For example, Nāgārjuna writes:

If a name and its meaning were not different,
the name "fire" would burn the mouth;
if they were different, nothing could be comprehended.

Here, Nāgārjuna is pointing out that so called conventional truth is not merely dependent upon names, as he writes:

Without an object to be felt,
feeling would not exist,
therefore, it is without a self.

You maintain that object to be felt lacks a nature.

At this point, this conversation is like two old guys at the docks at sunset — one guy looks at the sunset, and says "this is amazing", the other guy looks at it and says. "I've seen better."

The conventional truth they share is the fact that they both see a sun going down, they share a perception. Their "linguistic truth" is their subjective opinion about the aesthetic quality of the sunset. However, it is a little worse than that. This conversation is actually like two guys seeing the same sun set, and one of the guys claiming there is no sun setting at all — and not because the sunset is produced by the rotation of the earth, rather than the sun rising and falling in the sky.

It is examples such as these which shows you have deeply misunderstood the meaning of Nāgārjuna.

You may be entitled to your own "linguistic truths", however mistaken they may be; but you are not entitled to your own facts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 5:28 AM

Title: Re: Theravadin looking for a bit of suggestion

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Just that is, according to Mipham, "...the ultimate state of the sublime Dharma."

Astus said:

Seems to be no different from the Yogacara term citta-dharmata, that is actually the same as emptiness.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not the same as the Yogacara concept, they hold that as truly existent, albeit empty of subject and object, as Mipham says here in Liquid Gold:

The Cittamatrins deconstruct both subject and object in a mere empty intrinsically knowing pristine consciousness.

The difference is, as he says:

When the pairing of the dhātu and vidyā is deconstructed, there is no focal point upon which to grasp. Once it is understood that the final premise, “this is ultimate,” is deconstructed in the state of inexpressible emptiness, one enters into the nondual pristine consciousness that all phenomena of the inseparable two truths are of the same taste.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 5:22 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

smcj said:

infinitely more complicated.

.

Malcolm wrote:

My life only became more complicated when I made the mistake of turning off, tuning out and dropping in. Once I saw the effect of that, I returned to my former irresponsible, albeit, much more stress-free, turned on, tuned in and dropped out existence [albeit sans acid, etc.]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 5:17 AM

Title: Re: Theravadin looking for a bit of suggestion

Content:

Astus said:

And what is the dharmata of the mind?

Malcolm wrote:

Glad you asked. According to Mipham in his Commentary On Liquid Gold:

Dharmatā is the self-originated pristine consciousness that is the ultimate state of the sublime Dharma. It is not a conclusion arrived at by mental analysis and intellectual examination because such a conclusion is something arrived at and defined intellectually.

In Original Mind, he says:

[T]he unconditioned self-originated wisdom of the original empty knowing dharmatā of the mind of the eight consciousness is [8/a] the mind of luminosity [‘od gsal ba’i sems]

that is to be introduced.

Just that is, according to Mipham, "...the ultimate state of the sublime Dharma."

Astus said:

How is that any different from simply calling it "realising emptiness"?

Malcolm wrote:

Realizing emptiness isn't sufficient for buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 5:08 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

I know that in buddhist linguistic system the term "mind" usually is preferred. In science based system one often chooses "brain" instead. In contrast to "mind" "brain" is based on a visual sense impression independent of belief but only dependent on correct application of a term of conventional language. From the perspective of the two truths, both mind and brain do not exist through the power of their own characteristics but through the power of imputation.

Malcolm wrote:

Why would this be from the perspective of the two truths? What does ultimate truth [a veridical object of cognition] have to do with this?

Herbie said:

Well taking into consideration the development of a human person: being born, learning language, cognitive capacities arising dependent of this I think the primacy can make sense.

Malcolm wrote:

Relative truths [the objects of deluded cognitions] are not linguistic, they do not arise from names. Names are given subsequent to the arising of a given percept. The percept is not itself derived from a name.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 5:03 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Sure there is:

In the first statement, you claim that objects are external to the brain;

in the second statement, you claim that objects are produced by linguistic signs or

sounds. Thus, you directly contradict yourself.

Herbie said:

No, in the first statement I am saying that projected objects which are objects known that are immediate direct products of the brain do not enter the brain because they cannot.

Malcolm wrote:

That may be what you meant to say on reflection, but that is not what you actually said.

Herbie said:

And in the second statement I am naming causes for the production of objects known by the brain which are linguistic signs or sounds.

Malcolm wrote:

Which causes an infinite regress because linguistic signs and sounds are just objects known by whatever it is you believe knows objects.

That may be unsupported for a person completely denying today's conventional reality. No, it is unsupported because you assume that it is self-evident. Thomas Nagel would have a field day with you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 4:26 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

conebeckham said:

I am thinking that he is trying to say that the sum total of our experience exists only in the brain.

Herbie said:

I am saying that what is known is the direct product of the brain.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is another unsupported assertion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 4:25 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This:

Herbie said:

the objects do not enter the brain to be known by it but are its immediate direct products. With that nothing is said about the indirect causes.

Malcolm wrote:
Contradicts this

Herbie said:

Objects are products of the brain upon seeing linguistic signs or hearing linguistic sounds. So "essential nature" has to be sought in these objects as products of the brain not in their projections. Seeking "essential nature" in the projected objects nothing will be found.

you may delve into neuro science but actually it is just a matter of common sense of an educated person of present times to see that the immediate, direct cause of all phenomena known is the brain.

No there is no contradiction.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you trying to say that the cause of knowing phenomena is the brain?

Herbie said:

i am saying that phenomena known are products of the brain.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure there is:

In the first statement, you claim that objects are external to the brain; in the second statement, you claim that objects are produced by linguistic signs or sounds. Thus, you directly contradict yourself.

In the third statement, you make claim that phenomena that are known are products of the brain, another unsupported assertion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 4:09 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This:

Herbie said:

the objects do not enter the brain to be known by it but are its immediate direct products. With that nothing is said about the indirect causes.

Malcolm wrote:

Contradicts this

Herbie said:

Objects are products of the brain upon seeing linguistic signs or hearing linguistic sounds. So "essential nature" has to be sought in these objects as products of the brain not in their projections. Seeking "essential nature" in the projected objects nothing will be found.

you may delve into neuro science but actually it is just a matter of common sense of an educated person of present times to see that the immediate, direct cause of all phenomena known is the brain.

Malcolm wrote:

Are you trying to say that the cause of knowing phenomena is the brain?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

Objects are products of the brain upon seeing linguistic signs or hearing linguistic sounds.

Malcolm wrote:

This is an unsupported assertion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

smcj said:

Throughout history are there not fully realized Dzogchen masters that, from that perspective, reaffirm the appropriateness of the 9 yana system?

Malcolm wrote:

No one said it was inappropriate, it just does not apply to Sarma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 3:34 AM

Title: Re: Theravadin looking for a bit of suggestion

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

What else is to be realized? Vidyā.

Astus said:

What more does vidya include?

Apparently not, otherwise, Mipham would not have taken it to task.

I am not familiar with Mipham's intellectual-cultural context, where such terminology

was a problem, but I can imagine such a situation. Still, it doesn't look like that everyone in Tibetan Buddhism stopped using it.

Malcolm wrote:

Mipham writes in his Original Mind:

Once one has realized the meaning of the Great Perfection (the conclusion of the Dharma of the eight vehicles that make mind into the path) which makes pristine consciousness into the path, it is explained that buddhahood will not be attained until the vidyā of the Great Perfection, self-originated pristine consciousness, is realized. In other words, buddhahood does not come about solely from realizing emptiness, the dharmatā of emptiness, buddhahood requires realizing vidyā, the dharmatā of the mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 1:55 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

Look, if I say that this is my view who except myself could say so? Merely saying so supports that this is my view.

Malcolm wrote:

Your view is a claim about someone else's work [Nāgārjuna] and you have made no effort to support it. This renders your claim irrational, i.e., devoid of reason.

Herbie said:

No my view is my view. The only thing I claim is that my view is my view. you may call it whatever you like but that doesn't change my view.

Malcolm wrote:

Your view, such as you call it, is seated in irrationality since you refuse to support it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Theravadin looking for a bit of suggestion

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Really? Than please tell us what is to be realized.

Astus said:

The emptiness of self and phenomena, what else?

Malcolm wrote:

That is not all that is to be realized. This point of view is very heavily criticized in Dzogchen. What else is to be realized? Vidyā.

Astus said:

That is exactly what "union" means, tying two things together, for example, the union of a man and a woman.

For educational purposes it is fine to talk of emptiness, appearances and their unity. Then eventually it becomes clear that all three terms are conventional expressions.

Malcolm wrote:

Apparently not, otherwise, Mipham would not have taken it to task.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 1:30 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

Look, if I say that this is my view who except myself could say so? Merely saying so supports that this is my view.

Malcolm wrote:

Your view is a claim about someone else's work [Nāgārjuna] and you have made no effort to support it. This renders your claim irrational, i.e., devoid of reason.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 1:05 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

As to Knotty Veneer's contention that there is a link between schizophrenia and taking LSD, this is a problematic conclusion because no solid research has been done in this area given that LSD research was banned 50 years ago, and we understand the the brain and brain chemistry much better now, a full half century later.

The latest [2013] population study on psychedelics concludes:

We did not find use of psychedelics to be an independent risk factor for mental health problems.

<http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0063972>

Knotty Veneer said:

Well I have anecdotal evidence from my own acquaintances whose mental health has been negatively impacted by LSD use. I'd say - even if the jury's out - your mental health is too precious to risk losing for the thrills of a brief trip. Too risky for too little benefit.

Malcolm wrote:

The evidence shows that people who feel they have had negative impacts from LSD in

terms of their mental health had mental health issues to begin with. The reality is that there is no evidence that LSD use makes people go crazy or causes schizophrenia. I am not saying anyone should use psychedelics; the choice to do so or not should be based on fact and reason, not anecdote.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 1:02 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

Who are you to say what I can write here?

Malcolm wrote:

Malcolm

Herbie said:

Hi Malcolm

my user name is Herbie and my view is that Nāgārjuna's linguistic games do not uncover anything but may indicate to a reader of his verses that he, the reader or his brain, is inappropriately processing linguistic expressions.

Malcolm wrote:

You did not support this view at all, therefore, it is a purely irrational claim.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 12:59 AM

Title: Re: Theravadin looking for a bit of suggestion

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Thus the view in Dzogchen is the direct perception of pristine consciousness introduced by the guru, it is not a result of intellectual analysis.

Astus said:

That's at best a difference in method, of how to relinquish attachment, but not in what is realised.

Malcolm wrote:

Really? Than please tell us what is to be realized.

Astus said:

Or it is about criticising those who mistake emptiness for a reified concept of emptiness, a position already rejected by Nagarjuna and his followers.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not that.

Astus said:

Tying together would need two things to be tied together.

Malcolm wrote:

That is exactly what "union" means, tying two things together, for example, the union of a man and a woman.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 12:54 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

Who are you to censor me?

Malcolm wrote:

No one is censoring you. I am pointing out however it you are being very irrational by making unsupported claims.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 12:53 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

Who are you to say what I can write here?

Malcolm wrote:

Malcolm

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

DGA said:

Our friends in Silicon Valley will do *anything* to get a leg up. It's a highly competitive environment. I'd figure that DMT would be a more appealing substance there than LSD, given that the user can get in and out in half the time it takes to endure a guest lecture on "mindfulness" at the Google campus.

Malcolm wrote:

It's too incapacitating.

DGA said:

Even when smoked?

Malcolm wrote:

Yup. It gives you a ten minute buzz from which you come down rapidly; but it is a really, really intense high, much more intense than acid.

If you take ayahuasca, this trip lasts much longer [note: I have not done ayahuasca].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 12:46 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

No it is based on rational analysis of the linguistic expressions he uses in the context of linguistic conventions.

Malcolm wrote:

As long as you continue to make this claim without providing support, it is an irrational claim. Just because this is in the "Open Dharma" cesspit, it does not mean you can make unsupported claims.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 12:43 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

DGA said:

Now, do discussions like this belong on a Buddhist board? I leave that to the current moderating team to consider. The argument against is that it may be construed to encourage illegal activity (remember that this is an international board, and drugs that may have tacit acceptance here may be cut-your-hands-off illegal for some of our participants). Even in the first world. Are you familiar with the drug laws in Japan, for instance? yeowza... they thought of all that tentacle stuff just on sake.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course they do, since there indeed classic Buddhist texts which discuss the use of hallucinogens and their effects.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 12:42 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

DGA said:

Our friends in Silicon Valley will do *anything* to get a leg up. It's a highly competitive environment. I'd figure that DMT would be a more appealing substance there than LSD, given that the user can get in and out in half the time it takes to endure a guest lecture on "mindfulness" at the Google campus.

Malcolm wrote:

It's too incapacitating.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 12:40 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

Well that depends on the system of thought you are applying. your system is not everybody else's system so when you say "real" that may not be "real" in another one's understanding.

Bakmoon said:

I'm not just talking about philosophical systems, but about the underlying cognitive assumption of reality that underlies human mental processes. When I hold my hand out in front of my face, it looks to me like there is a real hand there. This isn't a philosophical position I've cooked up for myself, but rather is an innate human bias. It is this underlying error which Nagarjuna refutes.

Herbie said:

you are applying a system of linguistic expressions which is based on a system of thought. if you deny the relativity of your linguistic expressions then you are applying an essentialist system of thought.

Malcolm wrote:

This is just the Humpty Dumpty argument:

'When I use a word,' Humpty Dumpty said, in rather a scornful tone, 'it means just what I choose it to mean — neither more nor less.'

'The question is,' said Alice, 'whether you can make words mean so many different things.'

'The question is,' said Humpty Dumpty, 'which is to be master — that's all.'

Alice was too much puzzled to say anything; so after a minute Humpty Dumpty began again. 'They've a temper, some of them — particularly verbs: they're the proudest — adjectives you can do anything with, but not verbs — however, I can manage the whole

lot of them! Impenetrability! That's what I say!'

'Would you tell me please,' said Alice, 'what that means?'

'Now you talk like a reasonable child,' said Humpty Dumpty, looking very much pleased. 'I meant by "impenetrability" that we've had enough of that subject, and it would be just as well if you'd mention what you mean to do next, as I suppose you don't mean to stop here all the rest of your life.'

'That's a great deal to make one word mean,' Alice said in a thoughtful tone.

'When I make a word do a lot of work like that,' said Humpty Dumpty, 'I always pay it extra.'

'Oh!' said Alice. She was too much puzzled to make any other remark.

'Ah, you should see 'em come round me of a Saturday night,' Humpty Dumpty went on, wagging his head gravely from side to side, 'for to get their wages, you know.'

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 12:35 AM

Title: Re: Theravadin looking for a bit of suggestion

Content:

Astus said:

Terms like appearance and emptiness are meant for guidance...

Malcolm wrote:

What single entity ties them together? You still did not answer the question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 12:33 AM

Title: Re: Theravadin looking for a bit of suggestion

Content:

Astus said:

What higher view can be presented than not being bound by any view? It would be falling back to clinging to views.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, Mipham addresses this. One, the problem is what is meant by "view." In the Commentary On Liquid Gold he states:

Though all the objects of analysis of other kinds of analysis are doors for getting near pristine conciseness, pristine consciousness cannot be seen with them in and of themselves. All the activity of intellectual analysis obscures the pristine consciousness that is beyond thought by shackling it in the web of mind, just as a caterpillar spins its own cocoon.

He continues later by stating:

In the same way, when examined from the perspective of the emptiness that is free from all proliferation of the four extremes that is explained in the Perfection Vehicle, since there are no phenomena not pervaded by that emptiness, there indeed is a good argument that confirms that if there is a view better than that, that view would become a proliferation.

However, when examined from the perspective of realizing the dhātu (the object to be realized), or the method (great bliss), the view of mantra is very superior because the mind is very near the reality of the object [the dharmadhātu].

Why is the mind very near the reality of the object? After the first statement I presented above, Mipham claims:

Here [in the Great Perfection], since the pristine consciousness that exists within oneself is immediately apprehended just as it is with the intimate instruction of the critical point of the introduction, it becomes intrinsically clear to oneself without the need to be involved in a huge net of conceptual fabrications. That being so, once the result of all progress is attained, there is no rationale in hoping for another vehicle. Thus the view in Dzogchen is the direct perception of pristine consciousness introduced by the guru, it is not a result of intellectual analysis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 12:17 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

smcj said:

Apparently too there is a new practice of micro dosing with LSD [10 micrograms] to enhance creativity.

They tried that at Milbrook back in the day too, but then again it was just one of many "experiments" they tried on themselves. The lab rats had already been contaminated by other experiments.

Malcolm wrote:

It has been revived in Silicon Valley.

<http://www.rollingstone.com/culture/features/how-ld-microdosing-became-the-hot-new-business-trip-20151120>

Even though it is has been decades since the last time I tripped, I can definitely say I turned on, tuned in, and dropped out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:
smcj said:
Nay.

This is a public forum with some underage and a certain percentage of unstable members. We don't want anybody harmed or getting sued.

Malcolm wrote:

So is a library. I read Electric Kool-aid Acid Test when I was eleven, along with Teachings of Don Juan. I also did more than my fair share of acid, mushrooms, and so on, before meeting the Dharma.

As to Knotty Veneer's contention that there is a link between schizophrenia and taking LSD, this is a problematic conclusion because no solid research has been done in this area given that LSD research was banned 50 years ago, and we understand the the brain and brain chemistry much better now, a full half century later.

The latest [2013] population study on psychedelics concludes:

We did not find use of psychedelics to be an independent risk factor for mental health problems.

<http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0063972>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, December 5th, 2015 at 12:05 AM

Title: Re: LSD

Content:

Queequeg said:

Yay or nay and why?

Malcolm wrote:

The precept police will be all NAY! NAY! NAY! NAY!

The hippy squad will be all YAY! YAY! YAY!

Those with more level heads will say LSD is not going to help your practice at all, so there is not much point; but, taken safely, wont hurt your practice at all, so there is not much reason to object.

That being said, there is significant evidence that Shrooms in low doses has relieves PTSD, and may even encourage regeneration of neurons. Apparently too there is a new practice of micro dosing with LSD [10 micrograms] to enhance creativity.

So, there are no rules but those we impose upon ourselves.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 4th, 2015 at 11:44 PM

Title: Re: Theravadin looking for a bit of suggestion

Content:

MiphamFan said:

Malcolm, so do you now accept the 9-yana characterization of different views for different yantras?

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on the context. The main difference between the three yāna system of gsar ma and the nine yāna system of snying ma has to do with the three inner tantras. I am not convinced it is valid to analyze the mother and nondual tantras from the perspective of the nine yāna system.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 4th, 2015 at 11:14 PM

Title: Re: DW and Political Bias

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

To see how very little US Politics has changed [depressingly so] in the past 50 years, watch this documentary, Best of Enemies. Trailer:

```
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: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 4th, 2015 at 11:05 PM

Title: Re: Theravadin looking for a bit of suggestion

Content:

Astus said:

Yes, both good and bad dharmas are empty, kleshas are bodhi, and samsara is nirvana. That is not the same as refuting/denying the conventional existence of wholesome and unwholesome for deluded beings, as the driving forces behind the various forms of birth, as stated in the referenced aspiration prayer for instance. I did not say that Dzogchen uses specific antidotes, just that it recognises the function of various mental inclinations.

Malcolm wrote:

Your statement was:

Dzogchen maintains the distinction between wholesome and unwholesome, otherwise it'd be in denial in a way they accuse Hashang's doctrine. It's just that in terms of view one realises that all phenomena are empty, thus no need to grasp or reject. Same is taught in Theravada with the contemplation on the three characteristics.

You used this phrase in order to somehow make Theravada and other Hinayāna paths compatible with Dzogchen. It is not that they are incompatible, per se, but they don't reach the point of view of Dzogchen teachings. They are incomplete, from a Dzogchen point of view.

Second, who are the "they" making accusations. What denial are you claiming would be a result if Dzogchen does not make this distinction?

Astus said:

We were on your point about union of appearance and emptiness.

And they are so, nobody claimed otherwise. What you seemed to object against was summing up the ultimate view as the two kinds of selflessness, I guess because it may be mistaken for some annihilationist extreme, while Dzogchen likes to equally emphasise awareness and emptiness as the inseparable nature of mind.

Malcolm wrote:

In point of fact, Ju Mipham, since you invoked him, is not comfortable with the idea that there is a "union" or "nonduality" of appearance and emptiness, this is why he questions the idea.

The ultimate view of Dzogchen is not merely the two kinds of selflessness. It goes beyond that. Mipham's perspective, again, since you brought him up, is that the view of sūtra does not approach the view of mantra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 4th, 2015 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

i don't agree that Nāgārjuna's linguistic games uncovers anything but the readers inappropriate processing of language.

Malcolm wrote:

To return to this statement: this statement, without any support, is by itself an irrational claim.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 4th, 2015 at 10:26 PM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

No. I think that my understandig is common if not inflicted by irrational views.

Malcolm wrote:

Your understanding itself is beset with an irrational view since you are merely making unsupported assertions without providing any serious analysis to bolster your claim. It amounts to trolling, really.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 4th, 2015 at 10:16 PM

Title: Re: Theravadin looking for a bit of suggestion

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

All the big names in DC say folks should purify negatives and accumulate virtues. This is that view conduct thing.

Malcolm wrote:

While there is certainly a normative drive in the Nyingma school, The Mind Mirror of Samantabhadra states:

Do not engage in the root of conditioned virtue; if one engages in the root of conditioned virtue, it will perish.

As for whether or not one should engage in virtues or misdeeds, it is said that while there is no imperative to engage in virtue, there is also no reason to engage in misdeeds.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 4th, 2015 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: Theravadin looking for a bit of suggestion

Content:

Astus said:

So says everyone else in Buddhism. Skilful and unskilful acts bring about karmic results within samsara, and I see no denial of that in Dzogchen either, since it does talk about the lower and higher realms.

Malcolm wrote:

The demonstration of the freedom of vidyā from virtue and non-virtue: “Freedom from virtuous and non-virtuous actions” means the yogin who perceives his own vidyā. Since this vidyā is connected with the oral instructions of a Guru, in reality, even a paṇḍita learned in the tripitika will not come into contact with even an iota [of this vidyā] if it is not demonstrated. Therefore, it is called “relying upon the methods of secret mantra.” If demonstrated, it can even be seen by a poor cowherd. Therefore, it is “without good and bad karma”. If it is not practiced, not even Vajrasattva will be liberated. Therefore, “familiarity with the intimate instruction meets its measure”. Having practiced, even one who has committed the five limitless deeds will be liberated in this life. Therefore, it

is called “unaffected by the benefit or harm of good and bad actions”.

When vidyā is seen, since that alone is buddhahood and nothing else, one who nominally designates buddhahood is deluded. When vidyā is practiced, since hells do not exist, the one who designates hells has been taken by Māra. When vidyā reaches its full measure, it is shown that neither buddhas nor hell beings were ever established.

Therefore, it is shown that there is not the slightest difference between Buddha Samantabhadra and the King of Hell, Dharmarāja.

-- Vimalamitra

Astus said:

You have not eliminated the reification of oneness and manyness, that is the point of the question.

Are we still on the subject of selflessness?

Malcolm wrote:

We were on your point about union of appearance and emptiness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 4th, 2015 at 5:16 AM

Title: Re: Theravadin looking for a bit of suggestion

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

as the Soaring Great Garuda states:

Butchering, prostitution, the five uninterrupted deeds,
immoral behavior and that avoided by the world,
are totally perfect, the nectar of Dharma —
there is nothing other than great bliss.

Astus said:

It clearly says they are immoral behaviour. So there is awareness of a difference between good and bad.

Malcolm wrote:

Your contention was that:

Dzogchen maintains the distinction between wholesome and unwholesome...
But clearly it does not.

Astus said:

Still it maintains that for the deluded beings of the world those are unwholesome activities.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dzogchen point of view is that delusion is just delusion, and there is no liberation through engaging in deluded virtue, let alone avoiding deluded nonvirtue.

Astus said:

The question assumes that appearances and emptiness are two and need holding together. I do not hold such an assumption.

Malcolm wrote:

You have not eliminated the reification of oneness and manyness, that is the point of the question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 4th, 2015 at 4:02 AM

Title: Re: Theravadin looking for a bit of suggestion

Content:

Astus said:

But, as I said before, the teachings do not say that within samsara there are no good and bad, it's just that for a dzogchenpa the solution to that is the ultimate approach of neither grasping nor rejecting.

Malcolm wrote:

You said:

Dzogchen maintains the distinction between wholesome and unwholesome...

As I said, Dzogchen does not maintain a distinction between the wholesome and unwholesome, as the Soaring Great Garuda states:

Butchering, prostitution, the five uninterrupted deeds,
immoral behavior and that avoided by the world,
are totally perfect, the nectar of Dharma —
there is nothing other than great bliss.

Astus said:

I used the word unity, as in "one" and "single". There is no selflessness or emptiness as a thing or being anywhere, it's just how appearances are. Otherwise it would be assuming a self outside the aggregates, or taking the aggregates as one thing and emptiness another.

Malcolm wrote:

Yup, but you did not answer Mipham's question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 4th, 2015 at 2:33 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

But I have no investment in whether you understand Nāgārjuna properly or not, so I will leave it here.

Herbie said:

No problem since I understand and that's why I have done away with Nāgārjuna.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you evince no understanding of Nāgārjuna at all through your posts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 4th, 2015 at 2:02 AM

Title: Re: Theravadin looking for a bit of suggestion

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but where is anything defined as wholesome or unwholesome? Something to be accepted as opposed to something to be rejected?

Astus said:

The text goes on about the five poisons and how they're remedied by recognising the natural state. It also mentions the six realms here and there. Since it recognises the various types of births, as they depend on good and bad inclinations, it includes the system of the wholesome and unwholesome states. Of course, it is not really a text to get into the details of karma, but it is obviously presupposed.

Malcolm wrote:

The text says that there is a single basis, two paths and two results. It does not go into an analysis of accepting conditioned good things and rejecting conditioned bad things. It merely says that the difference between affliction and wisdom is vidyā and avidyā. It describes the state of samsara, but it does not recommend some practice of accepting and rejecting wholesome and unwholesome things. From the same text, my translation:
[M]ay all the sentient beings with clinging of desire
attain the pristine consciousness that realizes everything,
having mastered their own vidyā
through relaxing awareness into its own pristine state,
without externally giving up the torment of desire,
without internally adopting the clinging of desire.

Astus said:

The quote from Anyen Rinpoche talks about the unity of emptiness and appearances as the correct view, and not to take them separately. I see no contradiction between the two quotes.

Malcolm wrote:

In the Commentary on Liquid Gold, Ju Mipham asks the question:

Also, in terms of the claim, “appearance and emptiness are nondual,” what is the single identity holding both appearance and emptiness together as one thing?

One can say that appearances and emptiness are 'du bral med, that is, they cannot be put together ['du] or separated [bral], in other words, they are whole and indivisible, but to say they are a union, well, that involves a whole other set of problems as Ju

Mipham points out.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, December 4th, 2015 at 12:32 AM

Title: Re: Theravadin looking for a bit of suggestion

Content:

Astus said:

"It is the very state of unawareness, which is the cause of delusion. In that state you suddenly lose consciousness, and from that unclear state fear comes into being. From that arises clinging to self and clinging to other as enemy. This habitual tendency gradually grows, and from this a progressive entry into samsara occurs. Next, the five poisons of the passions develop, and the karma of these five poisons is unceasing."
(http://www.vajrayana.org/media/files/files/d74e3a90/Kunzang_Monlam_letter_format.pdf)

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, but where is anything defined as wholesome or unwholesome? Something to be accepted as opposed to something to be rejected? As the Tantra of Buddhahood as an Intrinsic Attribute states:

Again, Guhyapati said, "Oh Buddha Great Mass of Light, please teach the three things unnecessary for buddhahood."

The reply: "Guhyapati, listen! Since appearances automatically reversed, there is no need to purify bad karma and negative traces. Since pristine consciousness returns to its hidden nest, there is no need for deliberate meditation. Since there is no birth or death in one's vidyā, there is no need to avoid the suffering of samsara.

Astus said:

"Mipham Rinpoche tells us that we should not understand what appears and what is empty in the way that we understand light and darkness. The proper way for us to understand them is as fire and warmth. In this way, we become skillful at understanding emptiness and dependent arising, dependent arising and emptiness. There is no more profound understanding of the view of Dzogchen than this."
(Anyen Rinpoche: Journey to Certainty, p 134-135)

Malcolm wrote:

[T]he emptiness arrived at through the power of analysis does not rise above a nonaffirming negation, it does not become the view of Mantra...Someone who maintains that emptiness is good and maintains that existence is bad places great importance on the nonaffirming negation. The Bhagavan said that it is better to abide in a view of the personality complex the size of a mountain. The view of the nonexistence of the personality complex is wrong.
Commentary on Liquid Gold by Ju Mipham.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 3rd, 2015 at 10:44 PM

Title: Wholesome and Unwholesome in Dzogchen

Content:

Astus said:

Dzogchen maintains the distinction between wholesome and unwholesome...

Malcolm wrote:

Citation please, from an original Dzogchen text.

Astus said:

Rigpa is the knowing of reality, and such knowledge is the goal of Theravada as well. Assuming a self (an absolute) beyond the five aggregates is denied not only in Theravada but in Mahayana as well. There is also no disagreement in that it's not the skandhas themselves that are the problem but the attachment to them based on ignorance. So once reality is seen (no self inside, outside or in between the aggregates), there is no clinging, and without clinging there is liberation. Although that doesn't mean that there is no difference in terminology and in some methods.

Malcolm wrote:

If you think Dzogchen can be summed up by the two kinds of selflessness [persons and phenomena], you have not understood Dzogchen at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 3rd, 2015 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: Pure Land Buddhism and the Lotus Sutra

Content:

Queequeg said:

In other words, there must be some fundamental truth reconciling all the various teachings attributed to the Buddha; that all of the teachings come from a single source, with a single aim - and so essentially being the same teaching, are differentiated only by the exigencies of the circumstances of particular beings.

Malcolm wrote:

It can't be found in any book, it can only be found in realization.

Queequeg said:

A little vague there...

"It" being what? "some fundamental truth"?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 3rd, 2015 at 2:04 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

i don't agree that Nāgārjuna's linguistic games uncovers anything but the readers inappropriate processing of language. you may draw your conclusions and impute these to him but these are you conclusions but they may be correct nevertheless ... or wrong.

Malcolm wrote:

They are not my imputation, they are what he actually says in more than one place. But I have no investment in whether you understand Nāgārjuna properly or not, so I will leave it here.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, December 3rd, 2015 at 1:06 AM

Title: Re: Can objects attain enlightenment?

Content:

Matt J said:

This quote makes me think that Padmasambhava is advocating a monism of consciousness, like Advaita. For one, he says the sign is that the body disappears into pristine consciousness. The other is that non-dual means "sameness." But I would think this is not the case?

Malcolm wrote:

[T]he insentient and sentient both appear, but don't believe it...As such, the sign of non-duality is [the body] disappearing into pristine consciousness without any effluents because the critical point of the non-duality or sameness of the insentient and the sentient was understood according to the Guru's intimate instruction.

— Guru Padmasambhava from the Ḍākinī's Heart Essence

Yes, but that is not correct. Pristine consciousness [ye shes] cannot be monadic because out of it a diversity appears.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 2nd, 2015 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

He indicated inappropriate processing of language. that's it.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not just it. What he exposes is the essentialism that causes people to misunderstand the meaning of "arising from conditions."

Herbie said:

I see no contradiction to what I said. It is just about inappropriate or appropriate processing of language as signs and sounds which are free from meaning.

Malcolm wrote:

No, this is not the case. This misunderstanding may be expressed in language, but the misunderstanding itself is not linguistic, it is cognitive. Nāgārjuna's critique of language uncovers the cognitive errors which come when one's view is bound up in metaphysical assumptions about the existence or nonexistence of putative entities. It is for this reason that all his examples are about error-inducing perceptions such as illusions, mirages, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 2nd, 2015 at 9:17 PM

Title: Re: do you need empowerment to practice vajrayana?

Content:

Fortyeightvows said:

why do we see so much objection on dharmawheel to simply doing it the old fashion way-- that is finding a good buddhist teacher and following their instructions start to finish?

Malcolm wrote:

We don't.

Fortyeightvows said:

maybe it is better to learn mahayana from a good teacher then to learn dzogchen/tantra, etc on your own

Malcolm wrote:

It is not possible to practice Dzogchen or the two stages without a guru. It is also not really possible to practice Mahāyāna without a teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 2nd, 2015 at 4:28 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Rita_Repulsa said:

It is. And in the first chapter of the Immeasurable Meanings Sutra—which, of course, is considered a kind of preamble to the Lotus Sutra—this is described in a listing of the Buddha's attributes.

PorkChop said:

Just when I thought I was done buying books, I just realized that I have no copy of a sutra which actually lists those marks, even though I have a few that stress trying to visualize those marks (though I may not spend too much time on the horse weiner)... Thanks for

the heads up.

Malcolm wrote:

There is not much point in doing that, as the Vajracchedika sūtra points out, the tathāgata cannot be known from signs and marks,

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 2nd, 2015 at 2:57 AM

Title: Re: Pure Land Buddhism and the Lotus Sutra

Content:

Queequeg said:

In other words, there must be some fundamental truth reconciling all the various teachings attributed to the Buddha; that all of the teachings come from a single source, with a single aim - and so essentially being the same teaching, are differentiated only by the exigencies of the circumstances of particular beings.

Malcolm wrote:

It can't be found in any book, it can only be found in realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 2nd, 2015 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

garudha said:

Rather than thinking "Men are made from blue modelling-clay (and have male bodies) & Women are made from pink modelling-clay (and have female bodies)"...

I think it might be helpful to imagine that there is only one colour of modelling-clay and this clay is shaped into the appropriate form.

Therefore; I'm suggesting that only the nirmanakaya appears to be Male or Female but the dharmakaya and sambhogakaya are asexual.

Malcolm wrote:

Sambhogakāyas also have gendered appearances.

garudha said:

Okay, So would I be correct in thinking that the Vimalakirti Sutra explains a sambhogakaya of one gender appearing as a nirmanakaya of the other gender ?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is a parody of Hinayāna attitudes about women's potential to awaken. There is a doctrine that in order to become a Buddha, one first must be born with a penis.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, December 2nd, 2015 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Can objects attain enlightenment?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[T]he insentient and sentient both appear, but don't believe it...As such, the sign of non-duality is [the body] disappearing into pristine consciousness without any effluents because the critical point of the non-duality or sameness of the insentient and the sentient was understood according to the Guru's intimate instruction.

—— Guru Padmasambhava from the *Ḍākinī's Heart Essence*

dzogchungpa said:

Can you dumb that down a bit?

Malcolm wrote:

It means simply that the appearance of the insentient and the sentient is a delusion, and that in reality there is no such distinction at all. This is why I replied to Rita's question, "I've read some references to insentient life being enlightened. What does this mean?" with "Nothing." From a Dzogchen point of view it is meaningless to say that the insentient, living or otherwise, becomes enlightened since the categories of insentient/sentient are themselves predicated on a dualistic error and vanish in the state of buddhahood.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 1st, 2015 at 10:58 PM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

garudha said:

Rather than thinking "Men are made from blue modelling-clay (and have male bodies) & Women are made from pink modelling-clay (and have female bodies)"...

I think it might be helpful to imagine that there is only one colour of modelling-clay and this clay is shaped into the appropriate form.

Therefore; I'm suggesting that only the nirmanakaya appears to be Male or Female but the dharmakaya and sambhogakaya are asexual.

Malcolm wrote:

Sambhogakāyas also have gendered appearances.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 1st, 2015 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: Can objects attain enlightenment?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[T]he insentient and sentient both appear, but don't believe it...As such, the sign of non-duality is [the body] disappearing into pristine consciousness without any effluents because the critical point of the non-duality or sameness of the insentient and the sentient was understood according to the Guru's intimate instruction.

—— Guru Padmasambhava from the *Ḍākinī's Heart Essence*

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 1st, 2015 at 9:42 PM

Title: Re: Dzogchen and Time

Content:

steve_bakr said:

If you don't mind, I would like to state my understanding of time, and have someone comment on that, affirming or correcting my understanding.

Our conventional experience of time is that neither the past nor the future exist. Similarly, the present cannot be located, because as soon as we try, it is already gone. So, how does this square with intrinsic awareness in the "present moment"--or the here and now?

Malcolm wrote:

It does not -- the fourth time is beyond the three times.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 1st, 2015 at 8:57 AM

Title: Re: Can objects attain enlightenment?

Content:

Rita_Repulsa said:

I've read some references to insentient life being enlightened. What does this mean?

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 1st, 2015 at 1:09 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

rory said:

You are either flip or ignorant, neither of which bodes well for the discussion. I have to run to class so I can't go into this famous topic more but great Ch'an master Ta-hui and celebrated Dogen used the example of the Naga girl to show women's ability to become Buddha's among many others. For those with an interest I suggest you put Naga girl buddha into "Google Books" and find out more.

gassho
Rory

Malcolm wrote:

We have been over this before. There is no doubt that the message of the Lotus Sutra is that women can become Buddhas. Nevertheless, the Nāga princess changes her gender to male, and then proceeds to Buddhahood. She does not attain Buddhahood in a female form:

At that time the members of the assembly all saw the dragon girl in the space of an instant change into a man and carry out all the practices of a bodhisattva, immediately proceeding to the Spotless World of the south, taking a seat on a jeweled lotus, and attaining impartial and correct enlightenment. With the thirty-two features and the eighty characteristics, he expounded the wonderful Law for all living beings everywhere in the ten directions.

<http://nichiren.info/buddhism/lotussutra/text/chap12.html>

Then the assembly there all saw the daughter of the nāga king instantly transform into a man, perfect the bodhisattva practices, go to the vimalā world in the south, sit on a jeweled lotus flower, and attain highest, complete enlightenment, become endowed with the thirty-two marks and eighty excellent characteristics, and expound the True Dharma universally for the sake of all sentient beings in the ten directions.

https://web.archive.org/web/20150521183528/http://www.bdkamerica.org/digital/dBET_T0262_LotusSutra_2007.pdf

As I said, people clearly don't read very carefully.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, December 1st, 2015 at 12:12 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

odysseus said:

No, enlightenment is not about adapting to the circumstances all the time - enlightenment is about taking a stand, that's why Buddha was male and not a female "due to sexist dominated society". It's not his fault, it just couldn't be any other way in his days.

Malcolm wrote:

That is pretty much the definition of adapting to circumstances...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 30th, 2015 at 1:10 PM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Serenity509 said:

Some make a big deal out of the dragon king's daughter becoming a Buddha in the Lotus Sutra. Please forgive me if I'm wrong, but doesn't she become a man in the process?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, she transforms her gender, much to the astonishment of the retinue.

Serenity509 said:

If so, why is it used as evidence that women can become Buddhas, if she's actually becoming a man?

Malcolm wrote:

Because people don't read carefully.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 30th, 2015 at 12:36 PM

Title: Re: important buddhist text may have been authored by a woman

Content:

paol said:

How? Could you say, please. I'm curious.

Malcolm wrote:

All people suffer from the three poisons, how that manifests is to a large extent dependent on culture, in the same way that symptoms of mental illness are largely dependent on culture.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 30th, 2015 at 12:13 PM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Serenity509 said:

Some make a big deal out of the dragon king's daughter becoming a Buddha in the Lotus Sutra. Please forgive me if I'm wrong, but doesn't she become a man in the process?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, she transforms her gender, much to the astonishment of the retinue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 30th, 2015 at 5:25 AM

Title: Re: Dzogchen master's perspective [from The Sacred...]

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The mirror does not reflect truth. It reflects secondary conditions.

smcj said:

The mirror is purity and clarity. So it purely and clearly reflects the secondary conditions.
Malcolm wrote:
Relatively, when it is not recognized, it is called "the basis appears as the universe."

smcj said:

The pure/clear basis appearing as the universe? Purely and clearly? Truthfully.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that the mirror does not judge the appearances in the mirror, and reflects will reflect "real" and and "illusory" elephant without any judgement.

The basis appears as the universe under the influence of ignorance. The universe appears as the basis under the influence of knowledge. The basis itself has no judgment.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 30th, 2015 at 4:49 AM

Title: Re: Can you practice Tibetan Buddhism without ever had a Gur

Content:

Fortyeightvows said:

well then... can you name the eightfold path and the twelve links?

no need to respond here.

only you know the answer

Malcolm wrote:

Can you?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 30th, 2015 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: The sacred in Buddhism 2

Content:

kirtu said:

Kongtrul Rinpoche, delogs and others report classical Indian forms (because they are steeped in that imagery).

Malcolm wrote:

So, here you are suggesting that buddhas are conditioned?

kirtu said:

No, the beings reporting their visions are conditioned to some extent (including Jamgon Kongtrul, reportedly a 7th bhumi Bodhisattva). And we are conditioned as well. So great lamas like Jamgon Kongtrul and Chatral Rinpoche use conditioned language to talk to us about their experiences (for example, Chatral Rinpoche's reported visions).

Awakened beings view the world from a purified perspective and that's the point (and since the form isn't a mere emptiness it is able to engage in the world so other teachings

dealing with other aspects such as spontaneous arising, etc. are not excluded from the use of the image).

But for whom are these images, those to be tamed or those taming?

For those to be tamed and for teachers within a specific cultural milieu (see above - lamas reporting visions and otherwise communicating with us). People who have "adopted" Buddhism also sometimes see images from within this cultural filter.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

But mandalas, for example, are supposed to be reflective of the state of Buddhahood, not seventh stage bodhisattvas and so on. Therefore, it is impossible to believe that they are to be taken literally.

Since this bodhicitta, the essence of everything,
has always been the naturally perfected intrinsic nature,
there is no need for searching and practice with the ten natures.
-- Kun byed rgyal po

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 30th, 2015 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

smcj said:

What is "sacred" about the mirror?

It is Truth (Clarity).

Malcolm wrote:

No, since it reflects truths and falsity without discrimination.

smcj said:

The Truth of what? The Truth of the actions of sentient beings being made clear by becoming experience, meaning the law of karmic cause and effect.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no karma in the mirror. The images in the mirror are not part of the mirror.

smcj said:

It is Love. How so? Because Love animates the images on the mirror. Even hate is love that has been twisted and corrupted by unawareness.

Malcolm wrote:

If love animates the images in the mirror, it is not the mirror. The mirror is not capable of generating its own images. Images arise from secondary conditions.

smcj said:

It is Freedom (emptiness). With nothing fixed by having own-nature the images are 100% free to take on whatever form is appropriate to demonstrate the Truth.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, the images do not come from the mirror. The mirror does not reflect truth. It reflects secondary conditions.

smcj said:

And it is Purity. There no phenomena of either samsara or nirvana at all present in the mirror.

Malcolm wrote:

Then there are no images that come from the mirror.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 30th, 2015 at 1:59 AM

Title: Re: The sacred in Buddhism 2

Content:

kirtu said:

Kongtrul Rinpoche, delogs and others report classical Indian forms (because they are steeped in that imagery).

Malcolm wrote:

So, here you are suggesting that buddhas are conditioned?

kirtu said:

Awakened beings view the world from a purified perspective and that's the point (and since the form isn't a mere emptiness it is able to engage in the world so other teachings dealing with other aspects such as spontaneous arising, etc. are not excluded from the use of the image).

Malcolm wrote:

But for whom are these images, those to be tamed or those taming?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 30th, 2015 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

smcj said:

What I was trying to work towards, without much luck, is saying it is the mirror itself that is sacred. Thus a true Dzogchenpa would see everything as such, regardless of how painful or ugly it may appear. Everything would be both "non-dual" and "perfect just as it

is".

florin said:

But why apply labels such as sacred to that which is beyond any labels and categorisations ?

I don't know what others dzogchenpas see but I am pretty sure that sacred doesn't come into it..

MiphamFan said:

Exactly.

To say something is sacred implies that there is something not-sacred to contrast it with.

If there is nothing that is "not-sacred" then to say something is "sacred" is meaningless.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, for SMCJ, sacrality is important. Not sure why. For others of us, such as myself, the word "sacred" is not really part of my thinking. Sublime, profound, etc., these words are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: The sacred in Buddhism 2

Content:

kirtu said:

The use of Indian deity images is said to be literal by some teachers.

Malcolm wrote:

And I question this. It does not make sense.

kirtu said:

However if we assert that they are at least metaphorical*, then their intention is still clear as purified forms of offering and active purification through transformation.

Malcolm wrote:

It is one thing to see sadhanas as methods of transformation, it is quite another to assert that awakened beings experience their senses as this or that mandala decked out in 7th century finery.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: The sacred in Buddhism 2

Content:

kirtu said:

Our tantric sadhanas tell us how enlightened beings experience sense objects.

Malcolm wrote:

I doubt very much whether enlightened beings experience sense objects as half-naked little Indian goddesses.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

odysseus said:

Shakyamuni was a male, but he had plenty of female followers - because his Dharma is very real that women also can become enlightened.

seeker242 said:

Yes, like his mother/aunt. But my point was that him being born as a male was a "skillful means" and has nothing to do with abilities of men or women. If the society was a female dominated society, where all men were seen as lesser, he would have been born as a woman because that would be the most skillful means to teach.

Malcolm wrote:

We can see this possibility because we live in an open, secular, liberal society that values equal rights and civil rights— but it was not a possibility seen in the world of classical India, which is why there is so much patriarchal and misogynistic rhetoric in so many [but not all] Hinayāna and Mahāyāna sūtras, as well as the tantras.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

smcj said:

What I was trying to work towards, without much luck, is saying it is the mirror itself that is sacred.

Malcolm wrote:

It is just a mirror — it will reflect a golden Buddha statue or a golden bedpan with equal indifference. It will not discriminate this image and say "This is sacred" and reflect it more brightly, nor will it discriminate another image and say, "This is profane" and dim the image. The mirror reflects everything equally well without discriminating whether it is good or bad, large or small, etc. Why? Because the function of a mirror is to reflect anything placed before it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 10:59 AM

Title: Re: Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche & No Female Tibetan Rinpoches

Content:

kirtu said:

However as we know there have been some teachers and some current male teachers have studied with them.

Kirt

Malcolm wrote:

A few, mostly obscure, and known to us only through their renowned male students, consorts or relatives. Tibetan Buddhism, despite its many virtues, is still grounded in a heavily patriarchal and sexist system which reflects the acute gender biases which predominate Tibetan culture as a whole. Of course, we in the West need to understand the flaws and strong traces of patriarchy and gender bias which informs ourselves as well.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 8:36 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

smcj said:

OK, so now what do we mean by "non-dual"?

Malcolm wrote:

It depends, but for Madhyamaka, it means freedom from all extremes.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 8:23 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

smcj said:

Who said? Only buddhas have nondual experience 24/7/365.

This is a thought experiment.

What do we mean by "non-dual"? (I tried to start a thread about that a while back.)

"Without any references" sounds like there is still a subject. How is that not simply half of dualism?

Malcolm wrote:

There is no subject in nonreferential compassion because it is nonreferential.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 8:07 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

dharmagoat said:

I would expect he sees the suffering of beings in a compassionate light, acknowledging that pain is a cause of suffering, knowing that suffering is just a thought away.

smcj said:

How is that "non-dual"?

dharmagoat said:

(Let's try that one again...)

Compassion is about as non-dual as it gets.

Malcolm wrote:

Depends on what kind of compassion: compassion without any references is nondual. The rest are dualistic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 6:33 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

smcj said:

How is that "non-dual"?

dharmagoat said:

You got me there. Must the experience of a Dzogchen master always be non-dual?

smcj said:

Yes.

Malcolm wrote:

Who said? Only buddhas have nondual experience 24/7/365.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 5:39 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

smcj said:

As a thought experiment, I'd like to see what people think a Dzogchen master sees. Given that theoretically for a Dzogchenpa everything is perfect "just as it is". Obviously by "everything" they mean "everything", even the most ugly and painful things in life.

dharmagoat said:

As I understand it, a Dzogchenpa/Chagchenpa master feels the same sensations as others but perceives them differently. For example, without the conception of "this pain is causing me suffering", they may experience the sensation of pain without perceiving it as suffering.

smcj said:

Ok. And how does he see the suffering of others? And in what sense is it "non-dual"?

Malcolm wrote:

A Dzogchen master is just someone who has the capacity teach the path of Dzogchen. It does not mean he is realized. Chogyal Namkhai Norbu denies he is realized constantly; but he does not deny he is a Dzogchen master.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: Can you practice Tibetan Buddhism without ever had a Gur

Content:

byamspa said:

I respectfully disagree. HE Garchen Rinpoche said that "If you don't live nearby and cannot come, but with all your heart would like to, that is the right motivation for receiving the empowerment over the internet.

Whoever has faith and devotion will receive the empowerment regardless of where they are, because the dharmakaya pervades like space. Even if you come to the temple to receive an empowerment, if you have no devotion you still will not receive it."

Its really up to the aspirant and the aspiration generated. if you want it badly, then receiving it over ustream or skype can work. If your motivation is questionable, the results will be 2.

Karma_Yeshe said:

Yes. That is why I wrote full Vajrayana Empowerment. This is not only about the Dharmakaya. There are substances involed and you should make a connection not only with your mind-aspect but also with energy and body (all of them being inseperable). Also you should receieve the ritual implements and so on. How is that possible via Skype/internet?

All the best

Karma Yeshe

Malcolm wrote:

You will find, if you do further research, that these general conditions are not agreed to, sometimes, even within the same school.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 4:43 AM

Title: Dzogchen master's perspective [from The Sacred...]

Content:

smcj said:

As a thought experiment, I'd like to see what people think a Dzogchen master sees.

Given that theoretically for a Dzogchenpa everything is perfect "just as it is". Obviously by "everything" they mean "everything", even the most ugly and painful things in life.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen masters are generally just practitioners who have their fair share of pleasure, pain, suffering, happiness, and so on.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 4:22 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In return, I ask, how is blind adherence to scripture, i.e., Buddhist fundamentalism, genuine faith in the Buddha?

Tenso said:

I strongly believe that the Mahayana sutras were spoken by an enlightened being. Do you disagree?

Malcolm wrote:

Even if one believes that every word in the sūtras was spoken by the Buddha, this does not mean they all need to be accepted. Otherwise we are no better than fundamentalist theists who insist that every word of their holy scriptures was spoken by God.

In any case, since the appearance of Buddhas and the words that they speak are delusions conforming to the expectations and inclinations of those to be tamed, if the Buddhas enunciate sexist things, it is the flaw of the disciple to be tamed, not the Buddhas. Even if this is the case however, and we use this a rationale to excuse the Buddhas of culpability for such words and attitudes, those words and attitudes must still be confronted, not wished away with platitudes and vain apologetics.

That said, when we find things in the sūtras and tantras that are injurious to our sisters in the Dharma, they should be confronted, no matter who is supposed to have said them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 4:17 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is clearly chauvinistic and merely perpetuates androcentrism and misogyny in the Dharma.

Astus said:

Yes, and before that section in the Nirvana Sutra it talks about how women are full of insatiable desire. However, the reason I quoted it is, that it can be taken as one way of Buddhist scriptures tackling widespread misogyny prevalent in texts and societies. Instead of reading the negative characteristics of female birth as referring to biology, it transforms that to a spiritual level.

Malcolm wrote:

Which is even worse, since it engenders understanding and misunderstanding.

Astus said:

Sure, it's not that same as what one finds in the Soma Sutta and others claiming sex to be another mistaken self-identity, but as tathagatagarbha teachings are transitory teachings from self-view to no-self, it fits well into the scheme of gradually eliminating sexism.

Malcolm wrote:

Then it apparently failed in its job, in this instance.

The Vimalamirti-nirdesha's farce with the Goddess of the Ganges is a much more effective parody of endemic Buddhist doctrinal misogyny.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 3:39 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is clearly chauvinistic and merely perpetuates androcentrism and misogyny in the Dharma.

Tenso said:

You would rather cherry pick parts of the sutras that you like and throw out everything else that you personally disagree with? How are you able to have genuine faith in the Buddha?

Malcolm wrote:

I did not say that passage in question should be edited out — instead, it should be confronted and engaged for what is actually is — Buddhist misogyny.

In return, I ask, how is blind adherence to scripture, i.e., Buddhist fundamentalism,

genuine faith in the Buddha?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 3:26 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Herbie said:

He indicated inappropriate processing of language. that's it.

Malcolm wrote:

No, that is not just it. What he exposes is the essentialism that causes people to misunderstand the meaning of "arising from conditions."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 2:20 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Astus said:

"Anyone who thinks 'I'm a woman' or 'a man' or 'Am I anything at all?' — that's who Mara's fit to address."

(<http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn05/sn05.002.than.html>)

"Good man, it is in this sense that good men and good women who listen to this Mahayana Great Nirvana Sutra will always decry the marks that characterize a female and seek to be male . Why? Because this Mahayana scripture has the characteristic of manliness (pauru\$a). I am referring to buddha-nature. If someone does not understand buddhanature, then he does not have male characteristics. Why do I say this? Because he cannot grasp the fact that the buddha-nature exists within himself. I would say those unable to know the buddha-nature are to be called women. I would say those who are able to know themselves that the buddha-nature exists are characteristically male. If a woman is able to know definitively that the buddha-nature exists within herself, you should know that this constitutes her as male."

(Nirvana Sutra, p 301-302, tr Blum, BDK Edition / p 135 in tr Yamamoto)

Malcolm wrote:

This is clearly chauvinistic and merely perpetuates androcentrism and misogyny in the Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

smcj said:

Semantics. Scientific materialists reject it.

Malcolm wrote:

That does not make rebirth supernatural.

smcj said:

Karma is not moralistic; it is eudaemonic — in other words, the teachings of karma state that positive intentions and acts lead to positive outcomes.

Positive actions result in positive experience. Negative actions result in negative experience. In other words the truth of the nature of the action is made manifest/apparent as experience. That quality of "demonstrating the truth of the nature of the act" as either suffering or happiness is moralistic.

Malcolm wrote:

Not at all. Positive acts lead to positive sensations; negative actions lead to negative sensations — that is all the doctrine of karma-vipaka entails, nothing more.

smcj said:

Not judgmental per se, but divine justice nevertheless.

Malcolm wrote:

There is nothing divine about it.

smcj said:

The clarity of the basis shows the "truth" of the action.

The love of the basis animates that appearance.

The emptiness of the basis allows for limitless freedom for that expression to manifest.

Malcolm wrote:

These are all just pretty conventions.

smcj said:

Thus all 6 realms can be seen as the expression of the basis, or "The Truth".

Malcolm wrote:

No, the six realms expressions of delusion, not "the truth" in anyway shape form.

smcj said:

What do you mean by faith?

Belief in and reliance on things unseen.

Malcolm wrote:

The faith is not required.

smcj said:

The cheap shot would be to simply say "emptiness". But there is more than that. If, as the texts state, the universe came into being because of the karma of sentient beings left over from the last universe, that would mean that everything that is, is here because beings are working out their karma. But even if you ignore that cosmology, what is going on in life is both the creation and ripening of karma. As I've said above the workings of karma is itself the "Truth" demonstrating the nature of actions.

Malcolm wrote:

Emptiness is also not "true".

smcj said:

True, primordial purity, a Refuge for our suffering and an answer to the cycle of life and death.

Malcolm wrote:

None of this entails "sacredness", unless you want it too.

smcj said:

Actually you are worse than me on this score. I say that the Tibetans have their Dharma down better than us, and you say that the Tibetans in India don't have it down as well as the ones that stayed in Tibet. That's taking it even one step further!

Malcolm wrote:

I wasn't talking about realization.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 12:25 AM

Title: Re: Can you practice Tibetan Buddhism without ever had a Gur

Content:

conebeckham said:

Well, in Vajrayana we all start out as children, and play is a good thing. Necessary, even.

Malcolm wrote:

He was saying actually the opposite...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 12:23 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

And I read it like this — ancient India was a patriarchy, and had a cultural doctrine that women had inferior births.

seeker242 said:

I agree! Which is precisely why the Buddha was born as a male to begin with. It would be detrimental to the dharma to put himself in a place of perceived inferiority, even if that inferiority is not true to begin with.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, that was then, and this is now. We do not need to continue to cater to ancient chauvinism, or imagine it is somehow universal and will always be applicable.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 29th, 2015 at 12:13 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Serenity509 said:

There are several texts which suggest that, for a woman to become a Buddha, she must first be reborn as a man.

seeker242 said:

I don't read it like that personally. I read it like this...

Malcolm wrote:

And I read it like this — ancient India was a patriarchy, and had a cultural doctrine that women had inferior births.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 28th, 2015 at 11:48 PM

Title: Re: Can you practice Tibetan Buddhism without ever had a Gur

Content:

Karma_Yeshe said:

Yes. That is why I wrote full Vajrayana Empowerment. This is not only about the Dharmakaya. There are substances involved and you should make a connection not only with your mind-aspect but also with energy and body (all of them being inseparable). Also you should receive the ritual implements and so on. How is that possible via Skype/internet?

Malcolm wrote:

As my guru, a tertön and a great Dzogchen master, once told us, "Empowerments are the play of children."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 28th, 2015 at 10:45 PM

Title: Re: Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche & No Female Tibetan Rinpoches

Content:

ngodrup said:

Have you not heard of the 14

downfalls of tantric samaya? What is the 14th?

Malcolm wrote:

Because in fact there are so many places in the sūtras as well as classical sūtra literature that claim a woman is incapable of Buddhahood. The 14th downfall proves the presence of sexism in Vajrayāna, not its absence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 28th, 2015 at 10:42 PM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

smcj said:

Rebirth is supernatural.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is not. In order for it to be supernatural, it would have to have been brought about by some supernatural agency. Instead, rebirth is just about as natural as one can get.

smcj said:

Karma is moralistic.

Malcolm wrote:

Karma is not moralistic; it is eudaemonic — in other words, the teachings of karma state that positive intentions and acts lead to positive outcomes.

smcj said:

Faith is required.

Malcolm wrote:

What do you mean by faith?

smcj said:

There is an "Universal Truth".

Malcolm wrote:

Huh? No, there isn't.

smcj said:

There is "sacredness".

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, there is such a word, but it does not mean much, considering that "the sacred" means something different for virtually everyone. For example, for Hindus, cows are sacred; for Muslims, they are food.

smcj said:

Asians don't object to these issues. That's why their Dharma practices are more fruitful than ours.

Malcolm wrote:

Asians don't even have this language to begin with. And who says their Dharma practice is "more" fruitful?

smcj said:

It's not about race. It is about our additional cultural obscurations.

Malcolm wrote:

It is a pity that so many Western Dharma practitioners have this strange cultural inferiority complex.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 28th, 2015 at 6:55 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

maybay said:

Brave New World was a parody of America, if such a thing is possible.

Malcolm wrote:

While indeed contemporary American culture served as his artistic point of departure, the world he created owes everything to the Republic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 28th, 2015 at 4:18 AM

Title: Re: Rebirth, Karma & Emptiness

Content:

Bodhidharma said:

If HHDL suggested that the "very very subtle mind and body" goes on between lives, he has just taken the eternalism position. He has just suggested a soul.

Malcolm wrote:

No, since this subtle mind and body is not a permanent entity, it is a series of impermanent moments.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 28th, 2015 at 4:16 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Fascists love Plato's Republic, for they see in it a image of how they imagine themselves, philosopher kings all.

maybay said:

That is as much a reason to call Plato a fascist as it is to call someone wearing burberry a chav football hooligan.

Malcolm wrote:

You do understand that Brave New World is Huxley's parody of the Republic?

maybay said:

Whatever personal bias he might have revealed in his writings are almost inconsequential.

Malcolm wrote:

Nonsense, they are crucial to understanding his whole program.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 28th, 2015 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

MiphamFan said:

Sacred and profane are categories that are only used in Abrahamic religions.

Malcolm wrote:

Exactly.

MiphamFan said:

The outer tantras are about external purity, not sacredness.

Malcolm wrote:

Exactly.

MiphamFan said:

Buddhist morality is not about good/evil, it is about kusala/akusala. It is a far more realistic, positivistic morality.

Malcolm wrote:
Exactly.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, November 28th, 2015 at 2:35 AM
Title: Re: An American Buddhist on Thanksgiving
Content:
Malcolm wrote:

I am not saying we need to feel some kind of white guilt about it all. I certainly don't. I am saying that we need to remember and never forget where our "blessings" come from and how they were gained.

Serenity509 said:
I don't know, dawg. It would be unfair to judge American history from a different standard than we would judge any other country's history. Furthermore, I think you are neglecting the immense good that America has done for the world. Why is America, for example, the preferred destination for the world's immigrants? Also, why do immigrants in the United States own small businesses at a higher rate than the general population?

Malcolm wrote:
I think you really need to look into the history of US foreign policy and incursions, and evaluate "all the good" we have done in that light.

Rome had a pretty brutal track record in the ancient world, but it sure did not stop people from wanting to be close to the center of world power, back in the day.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, November 28th, 2015 at 2:12 AM
Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]
Content:
Malcolm wrote:

As for my contention, you yourself know that Plato's Republic starts with an "aristocracy" and concludes with a tyranny. I don't share Plato's pessimism.

maybay said:
Plato seemed quite optimistic about the possibility of rule by those who love wisdom, not by those who love honour. The condition under which successful democracies function today is the fact that those who love honour have a limited term, while those who love wisdom get to rule, albeit at a distance — the rule of law.

Malcolm wrote:
The problem is, as always, that it is the very fascist element itself imagines itself to be Aristos, and tries to enforce this tiered and class centered system on the populace.

Fascists love Plato's Republic, for they see in it a image of how they imagine themselves, philosopher kings all.

Our democracy is not founded on such Platonic ideals, and owes, in its political forms, much more to the Roman Republic than the Athenians, and formed out of similar colonialist expansionism. The formation and authorship of our government is in reality an expression of the Scottish Enlightenment, whose own roots are too complicated to merely sum up and lay all at Plato's door.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 28th, 2015 at 1:59 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

maybay said:

The Buddha will teach whatever aspect of the Dharma is suitable to the situation. You are suggesting he would repudiate his teaching on unattractiveness and never teach it again. This sutta does not suggest that.

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am suggesting that he was surprised and appalled at how badly he was misunderstood by his students. He certainly indicates he had no idea of what was going on during his retreat in his absence.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 28th, 2015 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

dzogchungpa said:

How about this: <http://www.accesstoinight.org/tipitaka/sn/sn54/sn54.009.than.html>?

maybay said:

In this sutta his first teaching was on unattractiveness and his second on mindful breathing. Teaching the latter does not contradict the former, nor require the Buddha to revise it. Why would you think it does?

Malcolm wrote:

I think dzogchungpa was referring to the fact that the Buddha was surprised that so many monks committed suicide because they misunderstood his teachings on the unattractiveness of the body, and modified his teaching accordingly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 28th, 2015 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

smcj said:

My point is, that there is no word in either Buddhism or Hinduism that maps to the adjective.

Point taken.

Now let us discuss English. Do you believe Dharma in general, and Vajrayana in particular do not have:

"sacred rites" dedicated to a religious purpose and so deserving veneration

(of writing or text) embodying the laws or doctrines of a religion: a sacred text.

regarded with great respect and reverence by a particular religion, group, or individual;
an "(whatever)" sacred to Tibetans

If these definitions conform to the practice of Dharma then it is appropriate to us the word when discussing Dharma in English, right?

Malcolm wrote:

Quite honestly, the word never crosses my lips nor comes to mind with regard to the Dharma. I think in terms of what is liberative and nonliberative. I don't think that there really is anything in Buddhadharma that is "inviolable", "sacrosanct", etc. In fact, I think the term "sacred" is pretty dualistic. In order for something to be sacred, there has to be something profane.

Of course I respect what other people hold to be "sacred," as long as it is not harmful to sentient beings. But since all phenomena are already perfect, where is there any room at all for the sacred or the profane? If you argue that we don't live in such knowledge and therefore, it is important that we have "sacred texts," "sacred rites," etc., you have just rendered your "sacred rites and texts" profane and mundane since they are only relevant to the ignorant and deluded.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 28th, 2015 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

smcj said:

It occurs to me that since the same terminology is used between Hinduism and Buddhism that "sacred Hindu text" may be very relevant.

Malcolm wrote:

My point is, that there is no word in either Buddhism or Hinduism that maps to the adjective. If you look in any Sanskrit dictionary you will find hundreds of things that are described as "sacred" — sacred this, sacred that, etc., not one single word maps to the word "sacred."

I suspect it is because the Buddhist/Hindu world view does not have heavily demarcated categories of sacred/profane.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 28th, 2015 at 1:04 AM

Title: Re: An American Buddhist on Thanksgiving

Content:

Serenity509 said:

As an American Buddhist, I am thankful for the blessings we often take for granted, despite our country's imperfections. Even when adjusted for differences in currency value between countries, the bottom five percent of Americans have a higher standard of living than 68% of the world's people, and the median household income is higher than 93% of the world's people.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, at the expense of 400 years of systematic ethnic cleansing and genocide of an indigenous population.

Serenity509 said:

Let's begin by asking whether the white man was guilty of genocide against the native Indians. As a matter of fact, he was not. As William McNeill documents in *Plagues and Peoples*, great numbers of Indians did perish as a result of their contact with whites, but, for the most part, they died by contracting diseases-smallpox, measles, malaria, tuberculosis-for which they had not developed immunities. This is tragedy on a grand scale, but it is not genocide, which implies an intention to wipe out an entire population. McNeill points out that, a few centuries earlier, Europeans themselves contracted lethal diseases, including the bubonic plague, from Mongol invaders from the Asian steppes. The Europeans didn't have immunities, and the plague decimated one-third of the population of Europe, and yet, despite the magnitude of deaths and suffering, no one calls this genocide.

<http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2006/02/whats-great-about-america>

Malcolm wrote:

In the beginning, Anglo settlers organized irregular units to brutally attack and destroy unarmed Indigenous women, children, and old people using unlimited violence in unrelenting attacks. During nearly two centuries of British colonization, generations of settlers, mostly farmers, gained experience as "Indian fighters" outside any organized military institution. Anglo-French conflict may appear to have been the dominant factor of European colonization in North America during the eighteenth century, but while

large regular armies fought over geopolitical goals in Europe, Anglo settlers in North America waged deadly irregular warfare against the Indigenous communities. Much of the fighting during the fifteen-year settlers' war for independence, especially in the Ohio Valley region and western New York, was directed against Indigenous resisters who realized it was not in their interest to have a close enemy of settlers with an independent government, as opposed to a remote one in Great Britain. Nor did the fledgling US military in the 1790s carry out operations typical of the state-centered wars occurring in Europe at the time. Even following the founding of the professional US Army in the 1810s, irregular warfare was the method of the US conquest of the Ohio Valley and Mississippi Valley regions. Since that time, Grenier notes, irregular methods have been used in tandem with operations of regular armed forces.

The chief characteristic of irregular warfare is that of the extreme violence against civilians, in this case the tendency to seek the utter annihilation of the Indigenous population. "In cases where a rough balance of power existed," Grenier observes, "and the Indians even appeared dominant— as was the situation in virtually every frontier war until the first decade of the 19th century—[settler] Americans were quick to turn to extravagant violence."

Many historians who acknowledge the exceptional one-sided colonial violence attribute it to racism. Grenier argues that rather than racism leading to violence, the reverse occurred: the out-of-control momentum of extreme violence of unlimited warfare fueled race hatred. "Successive generations of Americans, both soldiers and civilians, made the killing of Indian men, women, and children a defining element of their first military tradition and thereby part of a shared American identity. Indeed, only after seventeenth- and early-eighteenth-century Americans made the first way of war a key to being a white American could later generations of 'Indian haters,' men like Andrew Jackson, turn the Indian wars into race wars." By then, the Indigenous peoples' villages, farmlands, towns, and entire nations formed the only barrier to the settlers' total freedom to acquire land and wealth. Settler colonialists again chose their own means of conquest. Such fighters are often viewed as courageous heroes, but killing the unarmed women, children, and old people and burning homes and fields involved neither courage nor sacrifice.

So it was from the planting of the first British colonies in North America. Among the initial leaders of those ventures were military men— mercenaries— who brought with them their previous war experiences in Britain's imperialist, anti-Muslim Crusades. Those who put together and led the first colonial armies, such as John Smith in Virginia, Myles Standish at Plymouth, John Mason in Connecticut, and John Underhill in Massachusetts, had fought in the bitter, brutal, and bloody religious wars ongoing in Europe at the time of the first settlements. They had long practiced burning towns and fields and killing the unarmed and vulnerable. "Tragically for the Indian peoples of the Eastern Seaboard," Grenier observes, "the mercenaries unleashed a similar way of war in early Virginia and New England."

Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne (2014-09-16). *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States (ReVisioning American History)* (pp. 58-60). Beacon Press. Kindle Edition.

There is one feature in the expansion of the peoples of white, or European, blood during the past four centuries which should never be lost sight of, especially by those who denounce such expansion on moral grounds. On the whole, the movement has been fraught with lasting benefit to most of the peoples already dwelling in the lands over which the expansion took place.

—Theodore Roosevelt, "The Expansion of the White Races," 1909

I did not know then how much was ended. When I look back now from this high hill of my old age, I can still see the butchered women and children lying heaped and scattered all along the crooked gulch as plain as when I saw them with eyes still young. And I can see that something else died there in the bloody mud, and was buried in the blizzard. A people's dream died there. It was a beautiful dream ... the nation's hoop is broken and scattered. There is no center any longer, and the sacred tree is dead.

—Black Elk, 1930, on the massacre at Wounded Knee

Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne (2014-09-16). *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States (ReVisioning American History)* (p. 162). Beacon Press. Kindle Edition.

You said:

As an American Buddhist, I am thankful for the blessings we often take for granted, despite our country's imperfections. Even when adjusted for differences in currency value between countries, the bottom five percent of Americans have a higher standard of living than 68% of the world's people, and the median household income is higher than 93% of the world's people.

The word "blessing" is very apt here. Why? The verb "to bless" comes from:

Old English bletsian, bledsian, Northumbrian bloedsian "to consecrate, make holy, give thanks," from Proto-Germanic *blodison "hallow with blood, mark with blood," from *blotham "blood" (see blood (n.)). Originally a blood sprinkling on pagan altars.

So, yes, our "blessings" comes from the blood our ancestors spilt on the altar of European incursions into the the new world.

Serenity509 said:

It would be wrong to say that whites never killed natives. But again, we must judge American history by the same standards we'd judge any other country's history. For example, wasn't India, the country in which Buddhism was born, established by Aryan invaders who displaced the native peoples? Does that make India or Buddhism all bad?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, for in fact Europeans frequently killed natives, more often than not. As for India, we do not have an accurate historical record of the movements of Indo-aryans into India, all we have is myth and guesswork. But Europeans were so callous in their disregard to the First Peoples here, they willingly wrote down accounts of murder and pillage without a second thought.

Documented policies of genocide on the part of US administrations can be identified in at least four distinct periods: the Jacksonian era of forced removal; the California gold rush in Northern California; the post– Civil War era of the so-called Indian wars in the

Great Plains; and the 1950s termination period, all of which are discussed in the following chapters. Cases of genocide carried out as policy may be found in historical documents as well as in the oral histories of Indigenous communities. An example from 1873 is typical, with General William T. Sherman writing, "We must act with vindictive earnestness against the Sioux, even to their extermination, men, women and children ... during an assault, the soldiers can not pause to distinguish between male and female, or even discriminate as to age." As Patrick Wolfe has noted, the peculiarity of settler colonialism is that the goal is elimination of Indigenous populations in order to make land available to settlers. That project is not limited to government policy, but rather involves all kinds of agencies, voluntary militias, and the settlers themselves acting on their own.

Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne (2014-09-16). *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States (ReVisioning American History)* (pp. 9-10). Beacon Press. Kindle Edition.

Our blessings also come from the fact that as Americans, our colonial policies are so successful that indeed "the bottom five percent of Americans have a higher standard of living than 68% of the world's people" as you note. America is thus far the most successful experiment in European colonialism ever tried. It is important that we remember how we arose as a country, and not smother it in Hallmark sentiment.

I am not saying we need to feel some kind of white guilt about it all. I certainly don't. I am saying that we need to remember and never forget where our "blessings" come from and how they were gained.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 28th, 2015 at 1:02 AM

Title: Re: An American Buddhist on Thanksgiving

Content:

Serenity509 said:

As an American Buddhist, I am thankful for the blessings we often take for granted, despite our country's imperfections. Even when adjusted for differences in currency value between countries, the bottom five percent of Americans have a higher standard of living than 68% of the world's people, and the median household income is higher than 93% of the world's people.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, at the expense of 400 years of systematic ethnic cleansing and genocide of an indigenous population.

Serenity509 said:

Let's begin by asking whether the white man was guilty of genocide against the native Indians. As a matter of fact, he was not. As William McNeill documents in *Plagues and Peoples*, great numbers of Indians did perish as a result of their contact with whites, but, for the most part, they died by contracting diseases-smallpox, measles, malaria, tuberculosis-for which they had not developed immunities. This is tragedy on a grand scale, but it is not genocide, which implies an intention to wipe out an entire population.

McNeill points out that, a few centuries earlier, Europeans themselves contracted lethal diseases, including the bubonic plague, from Mongol invaders from the Asian steppes. The Europeans didn't have immunities, and the plague decimated one-third of the population of Europe, and yet, despite the magnitude of deaths and suffering, no one calls this genocide.

<http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2006/02/whats-great-about-america>

Malcolm wrote:

In the beginning, Anglo settlers organized irregular units to brutally attack and destroy unarmed Indigenous women, children, and old people using unlimited violence in unrelenting attacks. During nearly two centuries of British colonization, generations of settlers, mostly farmers, gained experience as “Indian fighters” outside any organized military institution. Anglo-French conflict may appear to have been the dominant factor of European colonization in North America during the eighteenth century, but while large regular armies fought over geopolitical goals in Europe, Anglo settlers in North America waged deadly irregular warfare against the Indigenous communities. Much of the fighting during the fifteen-year settlers’ war for independence, especially in the Ohio Valley region and western New York, was directed against Indigenous resisters who realized it was not in their interest to have a close enemy of settlers with an independent government, as opposed to a remote one in Great Britain. Nor did the fledgling US military in the 1790s carry out operations typical of the state-centered wars occurring in Europe at the time. Even following the founding of the professional US Army in the 1810s, irregular warfare was the method of the US conquest of the Ohio Valley and Mississippi Valley regions. Since that time, Grenier notes, irregular methods have been used in tandem with operations of regular armed forces.

The chief characteristic of irregular warfare is that of the extreme violence against civilians, in this case the tendency to seek the utter annihilation of the Indigenous population. “In cases where a rough balance of power existed,” Grenier observes, “and the Indians even appeared dominant— as was the situation in virtually every frontier war until the first decade of the 19th century—[settler] Americans were quick to turn to extravagant violence.”

Many historians who acknowledge the exceptional one-sided colonial violence attribute it to racism. Grenier argues that rather than racism leading to violence, the reverse occurred: the out-of-control momentum of extreme violence of unlimited warfare fueled race hatred. “Successive generations of Americans, both soldiers and civilians, made the killing of Indian men, women, and children a defining element of their first military tradition and thereby part of a shared American identity. Indeed, only after seventeenth- and early-eighteenth-century Americans made the first way of war a key to being a white American could later generations of ‘Indian haters,’ men like Andrew Jackson, turn the Indian wars into race wars.” By then, the Indigenous peoples’ villages, farmlands, towns, and entire nations formed the only barrier to the settlers’ total freedom to acquire land and wealth. Settler colonialists again chose their own means of conquest. Such fighters are often viewed as courageous heroes, but killing the unarmed women, children, and old people and burning homes and fields involved neither courage nor sacrifice.

So it was from the planting of the first British colonies in North America. Among the initial leaders of those ventures were military men— mercenaries— who brought with them their previous war experiences in Britain's imperialist, anti-Muslim Crusades. Those who put together and led the first colonial armies, such as John Smith in Virginia, Myles Standish at Plymouth, John Mason in Connecticut, and John Underhill in Massachusetts, had fought in the bitter, brutal, and bloody religious wars ongoing in Europe at the time of the first settlements. They had long practiced burning towns and fields and killing the unarmed and vulnerable. "Tragically for the Indian peoples of the Eastern Seaboard," Grenier observes, "the mercenaries unleashed a similar way of war in early Virginia and New England."

Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne (2014-09-16). *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States (ReVisioning American History)* (pp. 58-60). Beacon Press. Kindle Edition.

There is one feature in the expansion of the peoples of white, or European, blood during the past four centuries which should never be lost sight of, especially by those who denounce such expansion on moral grounds. On the whole, the movement has been fraught with lasting benefit to most of the peoples already dwelling in the lands over which the expansion took place.

—Theodore Roosevelt, "The Expansion of the White Races," 1909

I did not know then how much was ended. When I look back now from this high hill of my old age, I can still see the butchered women and children lying heaped and scattered all along the crooked gulch as plain as when I saw them with eyes still young. And I can see that something else died there in the bloody mud, and was buried in the blizzard. A people's dream died there. It was a beautiful dream ... the nation's hoop is broken and scattered. There is no center any longer, and the sacred tree is dead.

—Black Elk, 1930, on the massacre at Wounded Knee

Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne (2014-09-16). *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States (ReVisioning American History)* (p. 162). Beacon Press. Kindle Edition.

You said:

As an American Buddhist, I am thankful for the blessings we often take for granted, despite our country's imperfections. Even when adjusted for differences in currency value between countries, the bottom five percent of Americans have a higher standard of living than 68% of the world's people, and the median household income is higher than 93% of the world's people.

And:

The word "blessing" is very apt here. Why? The verb "to bless" comes from: Old English bletsian, bledsian, Northumbrian bloedsian "to consecrate, make holy, give thanks," from Proto-Germanic *blodison "hallow with blood, mark with blood," from *blotham "blood" (see blood (n.)). Originally a blood sprinkling on pagan altars. So, yes, our "blessings" comes from the blood our ancestors spilt on the altar of European incursions into the the new world.

Serenity509 said:

It would be wrong to say that whites never killed natives. But again, we must judge American history by the same standards we'd judge any other country's history. For example, wasn't India, the country in which Buddhism was born, established by Aryan invaders who displaced the native peoples? Does that make India or Buddhism all bad?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, for in fact Europeans frequently killed natives, more often than not. As for India, we do not have an accurate historical record of the movements of Indo-aryans into India, all we have is myth and guesswork. But Europeans were so callous in their disregard to the First People's here, they willingly wrote down accounts of murder and pillage without a second thought.

Documented policies of genocide on the part of US administrations can be identified in at least four distinct periods: the Jacksonian era of forced removal; the California gold rush in Northern California; the post-Civil War era of the so-called Indian wars in the Great Plains; and the 1950s termination period, all of which are discussed in the following chapters. Cases of genocide carried out as policy may be found in historical documents as well as in the oral histories of Indigenous communities. An example from 1873 is typical, with General William T. Sherman writing, "We must act with vindictive earnestness against the Sioux, even to their extermination, men, women and children ... during an assault, the soldiers can not pause to distinguish between male and female, or even discriminate as to age." As Patrick Wolfe has noted, the peculiarity of settler colonialism is that the goal is elimination of Indigenous populations in order to make land available to settlers. That project is not limited to government policy, but rather involves all kinds of agencies, voluntary militias, and the settlers themselves acting on their own.

Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne (2014-09-16). *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States (ReVisioning American History)* (pp. 9-10). Beacon Press. Kindle Edition.

Our blessings also come from the fact that as Americans, our colonial policies are so successful that indeed "the bottom five percent of Americans have a higher standard of living than 68% of the world's people" as you note. America is thus far the most successful experiment in European colonialism ever tried.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 28th, 2015 at 12:33 AM

Title: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

maybay said:

By the way this is a ridiculous assertion. You seem eager to promote the idea of a revelatory American politics free from European heritage, but this attempt at obfuscating history only signals your contempt for the past. An intelligent person without faith and respect will only see what he wants to see, no matter how hard he looks.

Malcolm wrote:

The only one who is obfuscating things here is yourself, who seems incapable of resisting the urge to engage in ad hominem fallacies.

That said, you are wrong. I really understand quite well how grounded the American revolutionaries were grounded in the contemporary thought of their day [The Scottish Enlightenment] and all the controversies and debates that raged in intellectual circles during their time.

As for my contention, you yourself know that Plato's Republic starts with an "aristocracy" and concludes with a tyranny. I don't share Plato's pessimism.

Arguably, however, it is Epicurus, through Lucretius's De rerum natura, who was perhaps the most influential Greek thinker during the revolutionary period.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 28th, 2015 at 12:06 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

tingdzin said:

This is NOT to say that rationality is not crucial in Buddhism; the acuity of the Buddhist teachers of the past in pointing out humanity's mental landscape is IMO one of two factors that have enabled Buddhism to continue over the centuries; the other factor is that individual practitioners of Buddhism have made their own the experience of what the sophisticated descriptions of reality are aiming at. And this leads back to the original theme of this thread, the sacred.

Malcolm wrote:

That which is considered inviolable is that which considered sacred: a shrine, a trust, a place, a word, bond, etc., generally because it has been blessed, but also because there may be some inherent quality which some place or thing seems to hold: such as a tree, a mountain, a spring, a river and so on., which will be ruined if it is despoiled.

The thing is, there is no adjective like "sacred" in Dharma texts (with perhaps the possible exception of brahma, i.e. brahmacarin, etc.) This, I submit, accounts for why there is so much disagreement among Western Buddhists about what is sacred and what is not, precisely because there is very little guidance on the subject from key source texts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 27th, 2015 at 11:39 PM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

tingdzin said:

Let's discuss the advantages and disadvantages of governmental forms in another

thread, please. There are enough such threads going on, or people could start another one.

Malcolm, in your post (Nov. 26, 10:04, too far back to use quote function) You say that "In Buddhadharma . . .there does [sic] not exist, nor could exist, any entities which lie, in principle, beyond the scope of Dharma explanation". This sounds to me like you are saying that there is nothing that cannot be, "in principle", conceptually explained. Is this an accurate assessment or not?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am saying there are no entities [dngos po, vastu] which in principle lie beyond the scope of Dharma explanations.

But even when we come to such things as Dzogchen and so, there are also example wisdoms which are given in the form of conceptual explanations. However, a conceptual explanation of sweet, no matter how detailed, will never substitute for putting something sweet on your tongue. So, while I think everything can indeed be rationally explained, even buddhahood, I maintain this is not a substitute for experience.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 27th, 2015 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: Can women become Buddhas?

Content:

Serenity509 said:

There are several texts which suggest that, for a woman to become a Buddha, she must first be reborn as a man. However, the biographical sutras refer to several women who attained arhantship. What is the difference between a woman attaining Buddhahood and a woman attaining arhantship? Why one and not the other? I am confused.

Malcolm wrote:

Its just sexist bullshit in the sūtras, there is no need to pay it any serious mind. The remedy for this can be found in the Vimalakirtinirdesha sūtra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 27th, 2015 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: An American Buddhist on Thanksgiving

Content:

Serenity509 said:

As an American Buddhist, I am thankful for the blessings we often take for granted, despite our country's imperfections. Even when adjusted for differences in currency value between countries, the bottom five percent of Americans have a higher standard of living than 68% of the world's people, and the median household income is higher than 93% of the world's people.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, at the expense of 400 years of systematic ethnic cleansing and genocide of an indigenous population.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 27th, 2015 at 5:29 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

maybay said:

The first king, Mahasamatta, was elected by consensus.

So?

Malcolm wrote:

So, it shows that leaders derive their authority from the people. Democracy merely enshrines that value as a norm.

And as I already noted, Aryadeva cogently points out the defect of kingship in his 400 verses. There is no divine right of Kings advocated in Buddhadharma.

Does he speak about democracy?

It is not necessary, it is long standing tenet in Buddhism that leaders derive their rule from popular consent, not from some inherent authority.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 27th, 2015 at 5:27 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

HH Dalai Lama exemplifies this view with his confidence that indeed science can explain confirm, and justify any and all Buddhist beliefs, but even more than that, he recommends abandoning any Buddhist tenets that are directly contradicted by scientific explanation and found to be definitely false from a scientific point of view.

Wayfarer said:

I previously brought that very fact up in a discussion with you, with the quote from his book, and you vigorously disagreed with it at the time, saying something like it was only due to some particular doctrinal position associated with Geluk-pa that he would make such a statement. I can go digging for it if it would be helpful.

Malcolm wrote:

Context is everything, I am quite sure I was disagreeing with the context in which this position of HHDL was invoked, rather than his position itself.

Wayfarer said:

The reason I say that naturalism is associated with utilitarianism is because naturalism eschews any notion of an inherent good.

Malcolm wrote:

No it doesn't. For example, there is no conflict between naturalism and intuitionism.

Wayfarer said:

Buddhism is not 'naturalistic' at all in that sense, that was the attitude of the Victorian 'protestant Buddhism' that wanted to show that Buddhism was compatible with so-called 'enlightenment values'.

Malcolm wrote:

Nevertheless, Buddhism is a species of naturalism, asserting that everything that occurs can be explained without resort to supernatural explanations.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 27th, 2015 at 4:02 AM

Title: Re: Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche & No Female Tibetan Rinpoches

Content:

Sonam_Phuntsok said:

I asked Dilgo Khyentse Rinpoche why there were no female Tibetan Rinpoches? My Dharma sisters have been discussing this issue for a while. They feel like they have no future in Tibetan Buddhism, and that as women, they will never be given the respect to teach like their male counterparts. I personally view my dharma sisters as equals to my dharma brothers.

Malcolm wrote:

They may have no future in Tibetan Buddhism, but this does not mean that they have no future in Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 27th, 2015 at 4:00 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

maybay said:

But then I'm uncomfortable with his suggestion that government is some kind of experiment. For most of history the most stable form of government was not democracy. Monarchy was not tried 'from time to time', on a whim. It was as natural as the sun in the sky.

Malcolm wrote:

The first king, Mahasamatta, was elected by consensus.

You should also study history — the most enduring govt. in the Americas prior to the

arrival of Europeans was Haudenosaunee Confederacy, a democratic union that began in the 12th century and continues till today.

And as I already noted, Aryadeva cogently points out the defect of kingship in his 400 verses. There is no divine right of Kings advocated in Buddhadharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 27th, 2015 at 1:37 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

MiphamFan said:

If you have really studied Graeco-Roman political philosophy you should know about anacyclosis.

Malcolm wrote:

It is quite understandable that the antidemocratic and antiseccular sentiments being voiced here are coming from a place of Buddhist utop/dystopianism. But since it is "Buddhist" it is not Dharma, and also not utopian. There is and never will be an external utopia. Utopia lies in liberating oneself. Dystopia lies in trying to liberate others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 27th, 2015 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

maybay said:

The Buddha's silence on certain matters is surely a lack of explanation. It is not the entities themselves which are mysterious, but the manner of their existence.

Malcolm wrote:

The manner of their existence is not the slightest bit mysterious. Buddha's silence regarded only metaphysical speculation. What is the point of positing a beginning to the world, when it is clearly taught by the Buddha that all conditioned phenomena are both causes and results? Why speculate on whether a tathagata exists after death, when he clearly taught that when someone attains cessation there is no longer any existence about which a nonexistence can be discussed? Each of the so called points of silence have a very clear and simple explanation, and are not a lack of explanation, rather, they are an encouragement to understand the Dharma. It is only those who do not know Dharma who believe Buddha's silences represent ambiguity on his part or some imponderable knowable only to an elect.

maybay said:

And it is not always the case that what can be explained will be explained. The difference is perhaps that the scientist will not admit mystery, and will typically

endeavour to explain whatever happens.

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha did not admit mystery either:

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. [1] 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."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 27th, 2015 at 12:03 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It is amazing to me that in this day and age that intelligent people, especially followers of Dharma, do not see the wisdom in the liberal, secular and open society that is the goal towards which the framers of the constitution were striving.

maybay said:

It's amazing to me that someone so sure of his model of political order should give so little attention to it's weaknesses. You say my dialectic reminds you of Plato. Well do you recall what his criticisms were of democracy?

Malcolm wrote:

Plato was basically a fascist, and the Republic a blueprint for fascism, so why should I care what his criticisms were? That being said, of course I am aware of his criticisms, but they mean very little to me since they are not valid criticisms. As Churchill remarked: Many forms of Gov-ern-ment have been tried, and will be tried in this world of sin and woe. No one pre-tends that democ-racy is per-fect or all-wise. Indeed it has been said that democ-racy is the worst form of Gov-ern-ment except for all those other forms that have been tried from time to time....

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 26th, 2015 at 11:02 PM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

Crazywisdom said:

Ya, and science has not found one yet. .

Malcolm wrote:

Mt. Meru?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 26th, 2015 at 10:10 PM

Title: Re: No External Objects

Content:

Wayfarer said:

As I pointed out, the fact that conditioned entities are derived from causes, is not a conception that is unique to Buddhism...

Malcolm wrote:

And as Nāgārjuna points out, "arising from causes" is incoherent.

Wayfarer said:

Does Nāgārjuna say that dependent origination is incoherent?

Malcolm wrote:

He says in the opening statement of the MMK that the meaning of dependent origination is that things do not perish nor do they arise; are not annihilated nor are they permanent; do not go nor do they come; are not different nor are they the same. Dependent origination pacifies proliferation about whether things, arise, perish, are annihilated, permanent, going, coming, different or the same.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 26th, 2015 at 10:05 PM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

HHDL has certainly seen "the wisdom in the liberal, secular and open society" - see Beyond Religion: Ethics for a Whole World <http://www.dalailama.com/biography/books>.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I know — I was referring not to him, but to others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 26th, 2015 at 10:04 PM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

Wayfarer said:

The only meanings are those we invent. In that sense, Western naturalism pretends to be 'value-free' but it's actually 'value-negative' insofar as it denies that there can be a real basis for values beyond the utilitarian - the greatest good for the greatest number. The idea that there is something 'inherently good' is not conceivable in its terms.

Malcolm wrote:

Meanings are invented, consensual and conventional.

As for your second sentence, it is very questionable that metaphysical naturalism is necessarily grounded in utilitarianism — I think you are making too broad a claim. For example, take this definition in which there is no species of utilitarianism mentioned: Naturalism, in recent usage, is a species of philosophical monism according to which whatever exists or happens is natural in the sense of being susceptible to explanation through methods which, although paradigmatically exemplified in the natural sciences, are continuous from domain to domain of objects and events. Hence, naturalism is polemically defined as repudiating the view that there exists or could exist any entities which lie, in principle, beyond the scope of scientific explanation.

Buddhadharma [and Jaindharma] in this respect is also a species of metaphysical naturalism — in Buddhadharma there is no mystery precisely because "whatever exists or happens is natural" and there does not exist nor could exist "any entities which lie, in principle, beyond the scope of Dharma explanation."

In other religions however [sans philosophical Taoism and Confucism], there is a profound mystery, God, through whose agency all things are created.

Indeed, this is one of the reasons why Buddhadharma is so appealing to westerners with liberal educations. The naturalism of Buddhadharma and philosophical Taoism fit well into our already metaphysically naturalist predilections.

HH Dalai Lama exemplifies this view with his confidence that indeed science can explain confirm, and justify any and all Buddhist beliefs, but even more than that, he recommends abandoning any Buddhist tenets that are directly contradicted by scientific explanation and found to be definitely false from a scientific point of view.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 26th, 2015 at 11:35 AM

Title: Re: DW and Political Bias

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

Left-vs-Right-politics.png

dzoki said:

Is UKIP conservative? I had the impression that they are libertarian.

Malcolm wrote:

Libertarians are generally conservative.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 26th, 2015 at 11:15 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

tingdzin said:

Excellent comments in a generally enlightening discussion. So it seems that the situation in the secular Western world is that it has for all practical purposes abandoned any notion of the sacred in favor of a consensus model which, as Queequeg pointed out earlier, is fungible as the whims of a mob.

Malcolm wrote:

The problem is, as is proven again and again, ideas of the "sacred" are just consensus notions as well, and just as fungible.

tingdzin said:

For me, it follows from that that each of us has to have some sense of what is "sacred" (don't let the word itself throw you, it's just a word) in Buddhism and why. If we have no experience of that, or lose sight of it, then all we are doing is blindly applying one more set of rules instead of applying the perspective of inner cultivation which is crucial to the Buddhist path.

Malcolm wrote:

\

"Rights" are not rules — laws are passed in order to preserve and defend rights. It is amazing to me that in this day and age that intelligent people, especially followers of Dharma, do not see the wisdom in the liberal, secular and open society that is the goal towards which the framers of the constitution were striving. Rights are the very thing that allow all of us the leisure and freedom to pursue the very inner cultivation which you extol here.

tingdzin said:

Sure, Chinese, Indians, and Africans can learn to speak in that way [i.e. about human equality], but those notions are unintelligible in their native cultures. They may just be mimicking what they have been taught.

Malcolm wrote:

This is quite patronizing. All people have an intuitive sense of their own rights and the rights of others, they do not need to be "taught", nor do they "mimick" once they have been taught.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 26th, 2015 at 6:25 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

Queequeg said:

One of the problems in the West with the rise of Secularism is that the entire Rights framework is ungrounded when religion, and specifically, God, is removed from the equation. The idea of Rights comes from a variety of sources including in no small part, Natural Law which has been understood as God's Law.

Malcolm wrote:

You should read Nature's God: The Heretical Origins of the American Republic. It may cause you to revise your opinion.

Although America's revolutionary deists lavished many sincere expressions of adoration upon their deity, deism is in fact functionally indistinguishable from what we would now call "pantheism"; and pantheism is really just a pretty word for atheism. While deism could often be associated with moderation in politics, it served principally to advance a system of thought that was revolutionary in its essence and effects. This essentially atheistic and revolutionary aspect of deism, I further contend, is central to any credible explanation of the revolutionary dimension of the American Revolution.

Queequeg said:

No, not really. The Founders were also profoundly influenced by the Roman Republic. Hamilton's ideal ruler was Julius Caesar. If you're familiar with ancient Roman civilization, especially as presented in Suetonius, Plutarch, Tacitus, etc., and then look at the early Americans, a very strong argument can be made that this is what they were modeling themselves on. For visual proof, look at Federal architecture and design; look at Washington DC. Their Deism/Pantheism looks and sounds like religion in the Roman Republic and early Roman Empire. Admittedly, it doesn't have the fervor and fanaticism of the Judeo-Christian sense, but there is still an underlying view of the world as conforming to a Natural Law; we may be looking at pantheism, but under that is a single divine order - not atheism. This guy is going too far. Admittedly I have not read any more of this article, but I don't think I need to if he thinks atheism "is central to any credible explanation of the revolutionary dimension of the American Revolution."

Malcolm wrote:

It is in fact an entire book, a large part of which concerns exploring the history of ideas behind Ethan Allen's Reason, the Only Oracle of Man: Or, A Compenduous System of Natural Religion. You should read the book in its entirety.

Queequeg said:

The Founders were influenced by Locke, not Bentham. If they were actually atheists, then Bentham would have gotten more play. Then again, they would not be able to say independence is compelled by Nature's Law and they would lose their basis in the inviolable fabric of reality for their revolution.

Malcolm wrote:

I never mentioned Bentham.

Again:

In a vital letter to John Adams, Jefferson makes clear that these Epicurean doctrines are essentially his own. "I feel therefore I exist. I feel bodies which are not myself: there are other existencies then. I call them matter," he writes. 69 Here he quietly paraphrases Lucretius, who says, "The common sensation of all men proves the existence of matter." Jefferson continues: "I feel them changing place. This gives me motion. Where there is an absence of matter, I call it void, or nothing, or immaterial space." Here he is all but quoting Lucretius: "There is, then, intangible space, void, and vacuity. Otherwise, movement would be absolutely impossible." Jefferson's conclusion is definitive, even militant: "To talk of immaterial existences is to talk of nothings. To say that the human soul, angels, god, are immaterial is to say that they are nothings." And here is Epicurus himself: "Those who say that the soul is incorporeal are talking nonsense." On the sources that inspired his views, Jefferson adds, "I believe I am supported in my creed of materialism by Locke, Tracy, and Stewart." But the manner in which he lapses into the language of Lucretius to articulate his ideas suggests that these later philosophers, whether consciously or not, served mainly as conduits for an ancient doctrine. Stewart, Matthew (2014-07-01). *Nature's God: The Heretical Origins of the American Republic* (p. 99). W. W. Norton & Company. Kindle Edition.

Queequeg said:

Maybe its also appropriate to point out on the day before Thanksgiving - another critically important document in early American identity is Winthrop's sermon, "City upon a Hill."

Malcolm wrote:

That is not a revolutionary period document. There are miles of difference between Puritans like Winthrop and "deists" like Franklin, Jefferson, etc.

Queequeg said:

Maybe the reason I have no problem with seeing America as Christian

Malcolm wrote:

America was never a Christian country, as it made very clear by Adams in the treaty with the Barbary pirates.

Queequeg said:

Anyways, whatever. When we all agree to hold something inviolable - ie. sacred - then we all have a common ground to build on. Without it, we're all but doomed to the fate of Babel.

Malcolm wrote:

Rights are inviolable and inalienable [i.e. inherent], and do not depend on being granted by some deity — a deity, who in any case, a large majority of the leaders of the American revolution did not believe in at all.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 26th, 2015 at 4:35 AM

Title: Re: No External Objects

Content:

Wayfarer said:

As I pointed out, the fact that conditioned entities are derived from causes, is not a conception that is unique to Buddhism...

Malcolm wrote:

And as Nāgārjuna points out, "arising from causes" is incoherent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 26th, 2015 at 4:33 AM

Title: Re: No External Objects

Content:

conebeckham said:

Neither Buddha nor Nagarjuna, nor any Madhyamaka teacher, argues for complete and utter nonexistence.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, as Buddhapalita states, "We do not claim nonexistence, we merely remove claims that existents exist."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 26th, 2015 at 2:52 AM

Title: Re: No External Objects

Content:

MiphamFan said:

What do you mean?

Malcolm wrote:

Their view is shorter, their results more shallow, they feel more satisfied with less...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 25th, 2015 at 9:51 PM

Title: Re: Can you practice Tibetan Buddhism without ever had a Gur

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

My point is that to practice Buddhadharma at all, you need a teacher. Otherwise, you are just left with this sort of vague intellectual idea of what it means to practice. You

need a teacher so that you can check your understanding. A book cannot do this for you.

Fortyeightvows said:

that sounds correct to me and it seems like this gets brought up here often.

however we do know that in many mahayana sutras, which are the words of shakymuni buddhha, that explain the benefits of reading them and listening to them. the traditions of tibet venerate many of these same sutras.

so while reading these sutras may not check your level of practice, they are still of incredible benefit.

you don't see these same types of promises in some other books or texts.

so should we read the book or text which suggests it only be read under some conditions, even if we do not have those conditions?

or should we read the text which promises mountains of merit to the reader?

if one truly believes in these things.....

Malcolm wrote:

Mahāyāna sūtras themselves extol the benefit of relying on a teacher.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 25th, 2015 at 12:55 PM

Title: Re: Rebirth, Karma & Emptiness

Content:

Bodhidharma said:

The Buddha said that he couldn't find anything permanent in the 5 aggregates. If you say that it is the mindstream that is reborn, then you are saying that the mindstream is independent of the 5 aggregates. You are saying that the 5 aggregates can disintegrate but the mindstream continues.

Malcolm wrote:

The mind stream is made up of impermanent serial moments of consciousness, thus there is no contradiction.

Bodhidharma said:

The fact that those "impermanent" serial moments of consciousness always associate with each other through lifetimes suggest that there is independence.

Malcolm wrote:

No, these moments perish as soon as they arise, causing the next in the series to arise. Thus, there is no independence, all such moments are dependent.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 25th, 2015 at 12:54 PM

Title: Re: Rebirth, Karma & Emptiness

Content:

Bodhidharma said:

I am sorry to say that I find the illustration poor. This suggests that the "water" survives the disintegration of the 5 aggregates and is therefore, independent.

Malcolm wrote:

Nothing transfers, but nevertheless, there is serial continuity. This is because in general causes and effects are neither the same nor different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 25th, 2015 at 12:52 PM

Title: Re: Rebirth, Karma & Emptiness

Content:

Bodhidharma said:

Causes give rise to effects....but why must effects necessarily be associated with the one who acted. This is what rebirth suggests. We are reborn with the causes of previous lives where in the new life, we expect the effects to ripen. To connect the effects to us means that there is something that is not dependent arising

Malcolm wrote:

No. The actions of a previous life do not depend on the presence of that past agent to ripen on a present recipient of action. All that is necessary is that there is a serial link between the past agent and the present experiencer of ripening. That is accounted for by the serial, momentary mind stream.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 25th, 2015 at 12:49 PM

Title: Re: Rebirth, Karma & Emptiness

Content:

Bodhidharma said:

The Buddha said that he couldn't find anything permanent in the 5 aggregates. If you say that it is the mindstream that is reborn, then you are saying that the mindstream is independent of the 5 aggregates. You are saying that the 5 aggregates can disintegrate but the mindstream continues.

Malcolm wrote:

The mind stream is made up of impermanent serial moments of consciousness, thus there is no contradiction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 25th, 2015 at 12:25 PM

Title: Re: No External Objects

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

IN general, people who practice only for this life get "faster" results.

smcj said:

I take it you've given up on regularly meditating on the '4 thought that turn the mind from samsara'.

Malcolm wrote:

"faster" is in scare quotes for a reason...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 25th, 2015 at 12:04 PM

Title: Re: No External Objects

Content:

smcj said:

I think it can be in this lifetime.

By all accounts it definitely can. However frustratingly it seems to be the case where if you practice "for this life" you do not get the results, but if you practice with the perspective of multiple lives it can happen in this life. It seems to have something to do with attachments to this life.

Now ain't that a kick in the butt?

tingdzin said:

Well, I wouldn't say "ONLY lack of self-confidence". I know a lot of people with all the self-confidence in the world, but who are nevertheless (and in some cases precisely BECAUSE of this self-confidence) probably going to be stuck where they are for a long time.

smcj said:

Yep.

Malcolm wrote:

IN general, people who practice only for this life get "faster" results.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 25th, 2015 at 10:54 AM

Title: Re: Can you practice Tibetan Buddhism without ever had a Gur

Content:

Nosta said:

But my point is this: since I cannot have teachers (I don't have anyone near me, I live in a non-buddhist country in an area without buddhists at all), can I, at least, practice such teachings? I have the feeling that I can't even try some of the teachings without transmission or I will not receive even 0,01% of the benefits.

I hope you can understand my position: I don't want to be superior to others, have practice without a teacher. I would love to have a [real] Guru near me, able to teach me. I would love to learn some of the teachings. But the only thing I can do is read some books and learn and practice from them.

Terma said:

First of all, I don't think anyone is trying to discourage you from practicing. Tibetan Buddhism has a very wide scope and there are many Mahayana practices that you could do, as well as shamata (calm abiding meditation), and other practices such as cultivating Bodhicitta.

But any such practice which falls under Vajrayana requires a transmission and at least a little instruction. As Malcolm pointed out, without a teacher this simply is not possible.

Malcolm wrote:

My point is that to practice Buddhadharma at all, you need a teacher. Otherwise, you are just left with this sort of vague intellectual idea of what it means to practice. You need a teacher so that you can check your understanding. A book cannot do this for you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 25th, 2015 at 6:09 AM

Title: Re: No External Objects

Content:

Wayfarer said:

If you were playing Russian roulette - not that anyone should! - then you have a revolver with one bullet in six chambers. So in five chambers, no bullet exists; in one chamber, it does exist. Pull the trigger on that chamber, you die; pull it on the others, you don't. So is the bullet in the sixth chamber 'not truly existent'?

Malcolm wrote:

No, the bullet in the chamber conventionally exists.

Wayfarer said:

I think the 'realisation of emptiness' is actually a state of being, in which you're aware of the interdependent nature of everything. That is the 'antidote to clinging' in my opinion. And what 'clinging' is, is the belief that the phenomenal realm, the domain of sense, is the only reality, which is worldliness.

Malcolm wrote:

You have given into realism, in so far as that you think the phenomena realm is real, in

any sense at all.

I looked up some google references on this topic. In Jay Garfield's essay, Why Madhyamika is not Nihilism, there is a quote from Tsongkhapa:

The key there is 'from the perspective of those people to whom we are speaking'. (I am among them!) So from the conventional viewpoint - their viewpoint - objects exist, and to deny they exist is nihilism. But from the ultimate viewpoint, objects are unreal, because they are essenceless. However that audience doesn't yet understand what 'essenceless' means.

As Buddhapalita says, "It is not that we claim nonexistence; we merely remove claims for existing existents."

Wayfarer said:

So there's no way to understand this if there are not degrees of reality.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no degrees of reality -- things are either real or they are not, whether or not they appear to be real. It is more accurate to say there are levels of appearances. Those levels of appearance depend on the presence or absence of delusion. A buddha could not be harmed by the bullet in the chamber.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 25th, 2015 at 3:41 AM

Title: Re: Can you practice Tibetan Buddhism without ever had a Gur

Content:

Nosta said:

So such books are not useful at all for someone without a teacher??

But I read some interesting things about the resting meditation of a kusulu. Why cant I just do that?

Malcolm wrote:

You can do whatever you like, but no one can guarantee the results.

All the buddhas of the three times had a guru, you are no different.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 25th, 2015 at 3:38 AM

Title: Re: No External Objects

Content:

treehuggingoctopus said:

I am but an amateur here, but to my knowledge Prasangika does not get rid of the distinction between 'external objects' and 'appearances' the way you suggest it does. At least not according to Longchenpa.

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, "Prasangikas" in general are happy with whatever conventional truth view you want to bring to the table. They may not agree with specifics of this or that view, but as they are all conventional, and therefore, rooted in delusion, conventional truths are not to be taken that seriously. But some people just don't get this and waste a lot of time arguing over the number of horns a rabbit has.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 25th, 2015 at 3:36 AM

Title: Re: Can you practice Tibetan Buddhism without ever had a Gur

Content:

Nosta said:

Can you practice Tibetan Buddhism without ever had a Guru (or master, rinpoche, whatever you call it)?

In every book I find* they always say -somewhere in the book- that you need to receive instructions in order to practice. Its like such books were made only for someone who already had a transmission (or empowerment...I dont know if there is any difference between such words).

Malcolm wrote:

You need a teacher. It is really that simple.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 25th, 2015 at 2:36 AM

Title: Re: Steven Seagal

Content:

smcj said:

Getting back on topic, maybe Rinpoche can cast Seagal in his next movie:

I'm a film crew member. I'd work on one of DKR's projects. It would be interesting, but I'd have to relate to him as "the director", not "the "lama".

Malcolm wrote:

On set, is there a difference?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 25th, 2015 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: What did Nagarjuna mean?

Content:

Dan74 said:

Maybe Nagarjuna is more about unlearning than learning? Unlearning all the self-making, all the affirmation-making, all the negation-making, all the dualisms? Not unlearning completely but just letting go so that reality shines through the conceptual

blinkers that we are so used to? And also seeing that the concept-making and the blinkers are the reality itself, are not-two from Nirvana, except that we get fooled by them. Even this getting fooled isn't anything real or external but an ancient habit, misunderstanding built on a misunderstanding, completely empty.

Trying to apprehend Nagarjuna might be a little like trying to grasp a sword that's swishing furiously in front of you. Put forward all that needs to be shredded to pieces, all the delusion, but try to grasp it and you'll get hurt.

/

Malcolm wrote:

Actually, Nāgārjuna is not really all that difficult to understand — it is the acceptance of that understanding that is difficult.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 25th, 2015 at 12:31 AM

Title: Re: Combatting extremism

Content:

MiphamFan said:

The status of women in Islam today is worse than 18th century Europe. How to fix it within our lifetimes?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, by encouraging Muslims to adopt liberal values, for one.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 25th, 2015 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: No External Objects

Content:

Matt J said:

So while on break, I've picked up a copy of the Ninth's Karmapa's Feast for the Fortunate. In the introduction, there is discussion about how Tsongkapha positing the inherent existence of a vase as the object of refutation, and that this is somehow different than the vase.

Malcolm wrote:

This objection has its origins in Gorampa's writings, in fact.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 24th, 2015 at 10:55 PM

Title: Re: Combatting extremism

Content:

mirrormind said:
...the status of women in society.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, as I wrote elsewhere, the core conflict between fundamentalists of all stripes [including Buddhist fundamentalists] and liberal values is the status of women.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, November 24th, 2015 at 10:47 AM
Title: Re: No External Objects
Content:
Wayfarer said:
The problem is that if you leave it at the point of saying that 'nothing really exists', you fall into nihilism.

Malcolm wrote:
One does not proclaim that nothing exists. One discovers that no existents can be found. This is why Buddhapalita states, "We do not claim nonexistence, we merely remove the claim that existents exist."

Author: Malcolm
Date: Tuesday, November 24th, 2015 at 6:02 AM
Title: Re: French Immigration Policies
Content:

Karma Dorje said:
It's not that the policy was too permissive. As I mentioned, immigration is absolutely key to the French economy. The problem with the policy is that it did little to integrate the immigrant populations in the face of deeply entrenched discrimination. It was only half a policy. The solution is not to stop immigration, the solution is to remove the barriers for immigrants taking full part in opportunity.

Malcolm wrote:
Prior to 74, French Immigration policy was full assimilation, i.e., become French. They relaxed that, and replaced it with "integration."

Karma Dorje said:
The unfortunate thing is that we are seeing fascism rear its head throughout the West. Trump's recent rallies remind me of the scene from the Wall with 'In The Flesh' playing. That guy is like a malevolent carnival barker.

Malcolm wrote:
Yes, it is very unfortunate. The only thing we can hope is that Trump has pissed off

enough women, blacks, and latinos to ensure he will never be elected and that the election will not even be in doubt.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 24th, 2015 at 3:44 AM

Title: Re: French Immigration Policies

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

In many ways, the North African immigrant experience in France parallels the Mexican immigrant experience in the US.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, which is why they are returning to Mexico, etc. in the hundreds of thousands. They just dont need to take this shit from fascist demagogues like Trump anymore.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 24th, 2015 at 3:43 AM

Title: Re: French Immigration Policies

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they do face these issues, there is no doubt. Nevertheless, it is not the case that immigration policies caused these problems, unless by this you mean that France gave up the policy of assimilating immigrants — expecting them to adopt French culture and values — and instead encouraged immigrants to retain their original culture and traditions.

Karma Dorje said:

The problem was not bringing in immigrants. Many European countries have low birth rates and depend on immigration to maintain their economies. The problem was that France brought them in as de facto second-class citizens. While they expected them to adopt French culture and values, they were still discriminated against even if they did. While progressives in France are amongst the best educated in the world, there is a strong current of bigotry that often extends to the highest office in the land.

In many ways, the North African immigrant experience in France parallels the Mexican immigrant experience in the US.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, so the problem is not immigration policies, per se. The issue is the colonial biases which still govern how many French people regard those from former French colonies.

Nevertheless, there were people who were North African descent among the people killed in France on Nov 13th, 1 Morrocan, 2 Algerians, 2 Tunisians and 1 Turk: 6 Muslims out of 130 people killed. And of course many more seriously injured.

Still, it makes no sense to try and pin the blame on some mistaken or permissive policy the French had for these attacks. It just contributes to the rise of fascist sentiments to give into scapegoating of Muslims in general, as I know you will agree.

Look at the hysteria in the US over Syrian refugees just because one guy had a fake Syrian passport. Now the Republicans are all worked up in a rabid slather.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 24th, 2015 at 12:02 AM

Title: Re: French Immigration Policies

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Those neighborhoods did not form because of immigration policy, they formed because they were places where immigrants could afford to live.

Karma Dorje said:

That's not entirely true. Many of the banlieue in question were low-income housing projects built to house Algerian and other African workers that came to France to rebuild infrastructure. France did a horrible job of integrating these workers into society. They face racism at every turn and high unemployment caused by discrimination.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, they do face these issues, there is no doubt. Nevertheless, it is not the case that immigration policies caused these problems, unless by this you mean that France gave up the policy of assimilating immigrants — expecting them to adopt French culture and values — and instead encouraged immigrants to retain their original culture and traditions.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 23rd, 2015 at 11:47 PM

Title: Re: Anarchist Buddhist teachers, present and past?

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Samsara is ordinary appearances and conceptions (ordinary experience) and according to Tantra it's this that has to be abandoned in order to attain enlightenment.

Malcolm wrote:

Nope, not even in sūtra, as the Āryabodhisattva-pitika states:

Developing sorrow for samsara is the provisional meaning;

The non-duality of samsara and nirvana is the definitive meaning.

The Hevajra Tantra states:

Having abandoned samsara for another,

nirvana will not be realized.

Samsara is form, sound and so on,
these phenomena are nirvana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 23rd, 2015 at 9:32 PM

Title: Re: Anarchist Buddhist teachers, present and past?

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

Dharma should be completely free from politics. Samsara cannot be fixed, it must be abandoned and to do this, spiritual paths must be free of worldly motivations.

Emptiness, and especially Tantra, is real anarchism.

Malcolm wrote:

The Hevajra Tantra explains nirvana can't be realized by abandoning samsara.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: Origin of mankind and animals according to Buddhism.

Content:

paël said:

Were the first animals of this world born from egg, womb, moisture or miracle (4 forms of birth)?

Malcolm wrote:

The first three, no animals are born by miraculous birth.

But, there is no account I am aware of that goes into detail on this issue.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: Something Else the French Got Right viz Terrorism

Content:

MiphamFan said:

Terrorist attack in Mali

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-34877069>

Northern Mali is still a jihadist front

<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2013/10/the-new-terrorist-training-ground/309446/>

Malcolm wrote:

That article is two years old.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 10:18 PM

Title: Re: Hyperbole around Syrian refugees in US

Content:

Dan74 said:

Anyone who thinks that the hundreds of thousands of refugees streaming into Europe are some sort of a covert Muslim army, needs to up the dose of their antipsychotics. Of course accepting them is the compassionate thing to do, but we should also see if we are ready to do much more - to do what it takes to successfully integrate them. This is the crux of the matter and it is no simple thing to integrate people coming from a very different culture and traumatised by the war. This is not a trivial matter and as much as progressives would like to sweep it under the carpet and the right-wing alarmists continue to whip up hysteria, there are very pragmatic considerations that need to be made, IMO. It entails a great deal of work.

Malcolm wrote:

Progressives are not sweeping the issue under the rug, they are embracing it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 10:00 PM

Title: Re: Hyperbole around Syrian refugees in US

Content:

DGA said:

Those of us who passed US history in high school may remember learning about Operation Wetback (for non-US readers--"wetback" is a racist slur against Latinos, particularly persons of Mexican descent)...

Malcolm wrote:

It is important to remember however that Operation Wetback was started because the Mexican Govt. wanted us to repatriate Mexicans illegally living in the US. We do not initiate it.

DGA said:

It's not necessary to initiate something in order to administer it. And that's what the Eisenhower administration did. There's another parallel--the Mexican economy fares very well with remittances sent home from expatriated family members working in El Norte, and the current Mexican gov't isn't going to disrupt that at all.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes we did administer from our side of the border, but the point I am making is that everyone paints Operation Wetback something the US started. We would not have started it. It started because the Bracero program failed, and significantly, because Mexico fields 5000 troops to the US border. That being said, I am not defending it.

DGA said:

more to the point, though: trying to initiate another round of this is just absurd and unworkable.

Malcolm wrote:

We agree, and now the less rational part of the GOP is doubling down on "yellow stars" for Muslims living in the US.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 9:37 PM

Title: Re: Refuge and practice from other religions

Content:

Lobsang said:

Yeah, also, I have one more question, there are mantras, for example, the Samjnaya mantra from the Golden Light sutra, that invoke 'Hindu' deities (Brahma, Indra), wouldn't that be also countering the Refuge?

Malcolm wrote:

No, they are Lokapālas, mundane protectors of Dharma. Also "Brahma" and "Indra" are really more postions of devas than individual devas.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 9:35 PM

Title: Re: Origin of mankind and animals according Buddhism.

Content:

Seishin said:

Does he say "mankind" or does he say "beings"?

Malcolm wrote:

Humans. But to answer the question, the asura, human, animal, preta and hells realm were all gradually filled sentient beings who took rebirth there from the third and fourth form realm.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 9:33 PM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

dhammafriend said:

From the Charter for Human Rights:

Article 1. All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Now tell me, how on earth the above statement makes objective sense outside of Semitic theological assumptions.

Malcolm wrote:

Because they are not Semitic theological assumptions, which general presume that people are not born free and equal, nor with dignity and rights.

dhammafriend said:

In fact, one could say the notion of 'rights' even generate conflicts.

Malcolm wrote:

Indeed, read the article supplied above.

dhammafriend said:

Need I remind you, we have tremendous cultural resources globally that can inform the discourse of rights for all people. South Asian and Asian cultures are rich with philosophies that deal with just that. Why are unscientific concepts like human rights, will, conscience etc boldly proclaimed as universal and objectively true? These ideas should ideally be sitting alongside other notions of the person and not be paraded around as facts.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, what is of value that you think contributes the philosophical conversation about theories of rights?

dhammafriend said:

Are we so intellectually bankrupt that we cannot conceive of better solutions for the decline in 'values'? Have we looked at social media? The internet and the flow of (mis)information, our shrinking communal spaces, lack of resources etc.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think our values have declined at all. In fact, apart from obvious barbarisms in the Middle East and Asia, I would say globally our values have all rather improved because humans are generally more well educated then they were 100 years ago.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 9:27 PM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

dhammafriend said:

My offering: the concept of (human) rights has its origins in generic Christian theology.

Malcolm wrote:

Not necessarily:

Intellectual historians have tangled over the origins of rights. These debates are sometimes framed in terms of when “the concept of a right” emerged. Yet insofar as it is really the emergence of the concept of a right that is at issue, the answer lies beyond the competence of the intellectual historian and within the domain of the anthropologist. Even the most primitive social order must include rules specifying that certain individuals or groups have special permission to perform certain actions. Moreover, even the most rudimentary human communities must have rules specifying that some are entitled to tell others what they must do. Such rules ascribe rights. The genesis of the concept of a right was simultaneous with reflective awareness of such social norms.

The more productive characterization of the debate within intellectual history concerns when a word or phrase appeared that has a meaning close to the meaning of our modern word. This debate turns on when in history the pre-modern “objective” sense of “right” came also to bear our modern, “subjective” sense of “a right.”

“Right” in its older, objective sense means “what is just” or “what is fair” (Finnis 1980, 206). Aristotle uses *dikaion*, for example, to indicate that a society is “rightly ordered”: that it displays the correct structure of human relationships “Right” in this objective sense can also be attributed to individuals. The Roman jurist Ulpian, for instance, held that justice means rendering each his right (*ius*). In this sense, a person’s “right” is what is due to him given his role or status. This objective sense of “right” is not the same as our modern idea of “a right.” For instance, Ulpian noted that the *ius* of a parricide was to be sewn into a sack of snakes and tossed into the Tiber (Tierney 1997, 16).

The scholarly inquiry into when our modern, subjective sense of “a right” became established as a meaning of some word or phrase has proved long and divisive. The ancient authors often used words imprecisely, and smeared their meanings across and beyond the Hohfeldian categories. The intellectual historians themselves have occasionally congested the discussion by taking different features of rights as definitive of the modern concept. Moreover, the scholarly debate has sometimes accepted over-optimistic assumptions about the sharpness of conceptual boundaries.

Nevertheless, two broad trends in the scholarly discussions are clear. The first is to push the origins of a term indicating a modern, subjective sense of “a right” back further into history: from Locke to Hobbes to Grotius in the seventeenth century, then to Gerson in the fifteenth century, Ockham in the fourteenth, perhaps even to Gratian in the twelfth (Brett 1997, Tierney 1997). Donohue (2010) now argues that *ius* is used in a subjective sense throughout the works of the classical Roman jurists in the first century BCE to the third century CE.

The second and related trend has been to establish that terms referring to active rights (what we would call privilege-rights and power-rights) predate terms referring to passive

rights (what we would call claim-rights and immunity-rights). It appears that the earliest medieval debates using recognizably modern rights-language, for instance, concerned topics such as whether the pope has a (power-) right to rule an earthly empire, and whether the poor have a (privilege-) right to take what they need from the surplus of the rich.

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rights/#3>

The rest of the article is worth reading because it clarifies many things.

Why does it have to be founded on (christian) notions that various societies cannot agree on?

They are not.

dhammafriend said:

Because in reality, thats really what we do. We agitate, we lobby, we protest, we disrupt, we destroy. All with the goal of finding 'space' for ourselves and our communities. The notion that all human beings are equal (equal to what?) makes no sense if you're not from a Semitic culture. Sure Chinese, Indians and Africans can learn to speak in that way, but those notions are unintelligible in their native cultures.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahah, it makes perfect sense if you are a Mahāyāna Buddhist, we all have buddhanature.

dhammafriend said:

They may just be mimicking what they've been taught. The other mistaken assumption is that they (Indians etc who communicate in english) are referring to the same object (the sacred) in their experiential world that english speakers are.

Malcolm wrote:

Read the provided article. The modern issue really begins with Locke, who was in no way a Christian theologian.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 9:10 PM

Title: Re: Refuge and practice from other religions

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

You can't impute Buddha on a worldly deity....

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahaha, well, I have news for you TKF, that is exactly what Pabhongkha in fact says.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 8:47 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

Tenso said:

Too much tolerance can lead to utter disaster as we have already seen now.

Malcolm wrote:

This is victim blaming. "Oh, the French were too tolerant. They should become less tolerant to prevent such attacks." This is really no different than saying of a woman, "She dressed like a slut, no wonder she was raped."

maybay said:

As politically incorrect as that might be there is truth in it.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no truth in it.

maybay said:

The passions of men should be guarded against as any force of nature. This is just good advice.

Malcolm wrote:

Lets put them all in burqas then, shall we? This is just giving into the forces of unreason. Fundamentalists of all stripes all wish to control women and what they do with their bodies. This should be resisted and defied in every way.

maybay said:

So here, the blame falls on the state not the citizens. The first purpose of a sovereign state (the clothes if you like) is to secure the lives of its people (the slut), and if it fails to do that then it is reasonable for it to bare criticism. The victims here are the citizens not the state.

Malcolm wrote:

So now, you have just infantilized women as a class of people who not only cannot make good choices, but should not be allowed to make choices, or least, should have their choices dictated to them.

maybay said:

When people are attacked the state is actually strengthened. Wanting to go about naked and uncontrolled is a product of vanity and shamelessness (which is really just a variety of mindlessness), which when met with rebuke from the world leads to pride and indignation. It's hopelessly samsaric.

Malcolm wrote:

Wanting to have the right to make choices about one's body is quite understandable.

maybay said:

Actually, it is not the tolerance of the French that was the problem, it is the intolerance and hatred of a few extremists that is the problem.

Personally, I think the best response to this is doubling down on liberal, secular values, like Slut Walk:

In the Jataka righteousness is framed as a virtue, but it is over-abundant in the west. Your call to respond with more of the same is shallow. It is profligacy like this that infuriates fundamentalists. They don't strike at liberalism per se (statue of liberty). They attack its abuses (capitalist skyscrapers).

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, we wouldn't want women to get all uppity now, would we? You are just basically taking up an oppressive refrain first applied to African Americans, and then anyone else who has called attention to their disadvantaged status through street protests.

I think there was once a fellow called Nigel Chamberlain. He pretty much argued the same way you do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 12:16 PM

Title: Re: Sources on Balance of Emptiness and Compassion

Content:

Zhen Li said:

I am interested in knowing what kinds of answers Buddhist texts, sutric and sastric, ancient and modern, give for reconciling the 'apparent' problem of perfect care for all beings, while abandoning conceptualisation. Discussions of meditations on compassion or wisdom in the sutras typically consider them separate, but does anyone know of sources which combine the two? Do you know of good arguments that the perfect state combining both compassion and wisdom are genuine psychological states, or are these rhetorical descriptions of the messianic mission of the Bodhisattva? Why, upon attaining the Prajnaparamita, does the Bodhisattva also have the aspiration to help other beings, rather than just abide?

If you have answers that you formulated yourself, of course those are welcome, but I am specifically looking for textual sources. The earlier the better.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen, baby.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 10:15 AM

Title: Re: French Immigration Policies

Content:

MiphamFan said:

French immigration policies allowed former colonial residents to migrate and form ghettos where dissent against the government could be fomented. I don't see how you can claim it's not due to their immigration policies.

Malcolm wrote:

Those neighborhoods did not form because of immigration policy, they formed because they were places where immigrants could afford to live.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 10:05 AM

Title: Re: DW and Political Bias

Content:

DGA said:

Generally, reasoned and fact-based discourse...

Malcolm wrote:

...tends to have a liberal bias.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 10:03 AM

Title: Re: Refuge and practice from other religions

Content:

Tsongkhapa said:

If you take refuge in the Three Jewels, why would you want to practise something that isn't Buddhism? Taking refuge in Shiva is breaking the refuge commitment.

Malcolm wrote:

According to the logic given by Pabongkha himself, if you regard Shiva [or insert worldly deity here] as a Buddha, then there is no problem with taking refuge in him.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 5:53 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is victim blaming. "Oh, the French were too tolerant. They should become less tolerant to prevent such attacks." This is really no different than saying of a woman, "She dressed like a slut, no wonder she was raped."

Tenso said:

It has a lot to do with the immigration policies of France. They bring in a huge number of

people in and allow Islamic ghettos to pop up all over the place which have been proven to be nothing but a breeding ground for these terrorists. You don't think that's a problem that France created for themselves?

Personally, I think the best response to this is doubling down on liberal, secular values, like Slut Walk:

That would do nothing but give more reasons for intolerant Muslims to hate the west.

Malcolm wrote:

I reply here:

<https://www.dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=47&t=21289&p=311879#wrap>

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 5:52 AM

Title: French Immigration Policies

Content:

Tenso said:

It has a lot to do with the immigration policies of France. They bring in a huge number of people in and allow Islamic ghettos to pop up all over the place which have been proven to be nothing but a breeding ground for these terrorists. You don't think that's a problem that France created for themselves?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I don't think this is correct. French immigration policies did not create this problem.

In this century, the first attack by an Islamist happened in March 2012. Then another in May, 2013. 3 in December 2014. Seven between January 2015 and now.

There are 4,155,000 Muslims and people of Muslim descent in France. I think it is a grotesque lie to claim that these attacks were caused by French Immigration policies. Most Muslims, or those of Muslim descent, in France are of either Algerian or Moroccan descent, immigrants from countries that were part of the French Empire.

It is estimated there are 1600 fighters in Isis from France. This is one out of every 2596 people of Muslim or Muslim descent in France. !8 for every one million people in France.

So, really, saying that this is a problem caused by French Immigration policies is just plain wrong.

Tenso said:

Personally, I think the best response to this is doubling down on liberal, secular values, like Slut Walk:

That would do nothing but give more reasons for intolerant Muslims to hate the west.

Malcolm wrote:

No, no more than claiming that woman who wear "provocative" clothes are giving rapists a justification for raping them.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 3:58 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

Tenso said:

Too much tolerance can lead to utter disaster as we have already seen now.

Malcolm wrote:

This is victim blaming. "Oh, the French were too tolerant. They should become less tolerant to prevent such attacks." This is really no different than saying of a women, "She dressed like a slut, no wonder she was raped."

Actually, it is not the tolerance of the French that was the problem, it is the intolerance and hatred of a few extremists that is the problem.

Personally, I think the best response to this is doubling down on liberal, secular values, like Slut Walk:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 2:43 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

maybay said:

Tenso, why would you say we should abandon these values?

Malcolm wrote:

Did he?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: important buddhist text may have been authored by a woma

Content:

Tenso said:

Agreed. Talking from experience, we westerners are quite a narcissistic and egotistical bunch compared to our fellow practitioners in Asia.

DGA said:

Case in point...

<http://www.tricycle.com/interview/after-buddhism>

Malcolm wrote:

Saw him speak at Smith College recently. It was a snore.

However, again, I must disagree with Tenso. Ego and narcissism are social constructs, the difference between westerners and asians is mainly the source from where their ego and narcissism springs, asians are no less egotistical and narcissistic than westerners. They are just egotistical and narcissistic in a different way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 20th, 2015 at 1:10 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

Tenso said:

I agree with these values but they can also be considered a weakness. Look at France for example. An extremely liberal country and consistent victim of terrorist attacks.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I don't think we should abandon such values merely because there are some people who are insane enough not to see their value and benefit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 19th, 2015 at 11:18 PM

Title: Re: Hyperbole around Syrian refugees in US

Content:

DGA said:

Those of us who passed US history in high school may remember learning about Operation Wetback (for non-US readers--"wetback" is a racist slur against Latinos, particularly persons of Mexican descent)...

Malcolm wrote:

It is important to remember however that Operation Wetback was started because the Mexican Govt. wanted us to repatriate Mexicans illegally living in the US. We do not initiate it.

DGA said:

Right now, the loudest voices in US political discourse are behaving, quite frankly, like cowards...

Malcolm wrote:

Bellicose cowards...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 19th, 2015 at 5:46 AM

Title: Re: Alaya-vijnana it is shared or subjective storage?

Content:

Wayfarer said:

What is the meaning of 'not established in any way?'

And isn't Bodhicitta distinguished by, or associated with, 'compassion for all sentient beings'?

Malcolm wrote:

Here, bodhicitta, awakened mind, refers to the basis, not compassion in the Mahāyāna sense. Not established means any predicates such as it exists, it does not exist and so on do not apply.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 19th, 2015 at 2:41 AM

Title: Re: chogyam trungpa ...?

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 19th, 2015 at 2:31 AM

Title: Re: No means No

Content:

boda said:

You don't believe Bodhisattvas are infallible?

smcj said:

Since a bodhisattva still has some traces of obstruction, to the same degree he "casts a shadow" and is fallible.

boda said:

Punya was saying that a Bodhisattvas wisdom is flawless. You don't believe this? You believe they can make mistakes?

Malcolm wrote:

When a Bodhisattva is in meditative equipoise, his wisdom is infallible. But Bodhisattvas do not spend their entire life sitting in meditation, so therefore, when they are not in equipoise, it is possible for them to have errors.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 19th, 2015 at 2:29 AM

Title: Re: No means No

Content:

boda said:

Look at the video below from a documentary about him. He created an army and had his followers marching around for hours at a time. Seemingly somewhat antithetical to Buddhist practice, but we have to say that we are too ignorant to see the wisdom of it.

Malcolm wrote:

Speak for yourself.

boda said:

You don't believe Bodhisattvas are infallible?

Malcolm wrote:

That is not what I meant, but nevertheless, I will explain. Not all of use are too ignorant to see the wisdom of Trungpa's methods, which is why I posted Gesar's picture, since Gesar is an example of a Buddha who led an army and defeated many enemies.

Now then, in response to your reply, my friend, I suggest you STUDY some Dharma, preferably with a qualified teacher.

Bodhisattvas are not infallible. Why? Because they have obscurations of knowledge, even right up to the tenth bhumi. And up to the seventh bhumi, they have obscurations of affliction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 19th, 2015 at 1:38 AM

Title: Re: No means No

Content:

boda said:

Look at the video below from a documentary about him. He created an army and had his followers marching around for hours at a time. Seemingly somewhat antithetical to Buddhist practice, but we have to say that we are too ignorant to see the wisdom of it.

Malcolm wrote:

Speak for yourself.

Gesar of Ling

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 19th, 2015 at 1:35 AM

Title: Re: Alaya-vijnana it is shared or subjective storage?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

I think I understand where OP is coming from with this question. If the alayavijnana is completely personal, then where are collective karmic traces stored? Do you just have ever your own personal copy of the collective karma?

Malcolm wrote:

There are not traces of collective karma. There are traces which sufficiently resemble each other in each of our minds to create a common vision of the container universe.

smcj said:

If I'm not mistaken this is the general consensus of the Cittamatra view, right? If so, and given your post from another thread, Not really, Dzogchen is not cittamatra.

With your second post I am led to believe that the "traces which sufficiently resemble each other in each of our minds to create a common vision of the container universe" is not a Dzogchen view, right? If I'm right about that, and that being the case, what is the Dzogchen perspective on the "commonality of the container universe"?

Malcolm wrote:

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.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 19th, 2015 at 12:27 AM

Title: Re: Loving Kindness Meditation

Content:

gloriasteinem said:

I think it is an emotion. Love comes from the heart, kindness too. I think the mind itself could be very cold or at least too conceptual to show these. They come from the heart chakra. I know it not because I'm emotional but because usually I'm not, I'm a more thoughtful person and there is a constant need for me to feel/learn this from outside, other people. Mind even when peaceful cannot give loving kindness but can give place for the heart to release such.

Seishin said:

I think metta is better translated as "benevolence" rather than loving kindness. Also note: metta is not love and kindness, it is kindness that is loving.

Malcolm wrote:

Maitri is the wish that someone have happiness and the cause of happiness. Translating metta/Matri as "love" is just fine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 19th, 2015 at 12:19 AM

Title: Re: No External Objects

Content:

Matt J said:

Mipham's Chittamatra approach to dharms resolves all those pesky questions about rebirth, siddhis, body of light, the brain.

Malcolm wrote:

Not really, Dzogchen is not cittamatra.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 18th, 2015 at 11:16 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

I'm disappointed by your response regarding the 'worldliness' of spiritual paths. Spiritual paths can be in the world but not of the world - you have to have a Dharma that is matched to a person's capacity and ability to practice and it has to be practical but in order to function it has to be free from politics and worldly concerns. I'm surprised you don't understand this. A spiritual path cannot be leading you deeper into samsara.

Malcolm wrote:

A true spiritual path must engage the world, not seek to rise above it. We live in the world. Our path is only of value insofar as in transforming ourselves, others around us are transformed and in the end, the world is transformed. That transformation requires a stable country, economic prosperity and freedom for everyone. Those last three goals are best secured in an open, liberal, democratic state based on robust secular ethics. The Dalai Lama understands this, I am surprised you don't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 18th, 2015 at 10:34 PM

Title: Re: Alaya-vijnana it is shared or subjective storage?

Content:

tomamundsen said:

I think I understand where OP is coming from with this question. If the alayavijnana is completely personal, then where are collective karmic traces stored? Do you just have ever your own personal copy of the collective karma?

Malcolm wrote:

There are not traces of collective karma. There are traces which sufficiently resemble each other in each of our minds to create a common vision of the container universe.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 18th, 2015 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Multiple terrorist attacks in Paris - Hostage situation

Content:

Ayu said:

Is there anybody still willing to discuss the topic?

Malcolm wrote:

Not in the face of suspension of freedom of speech. I can't believe you erased those links to Dabiq.

How do you expect people to be informed about the issues if you censor necessary information?

This server is located in the US, not in Europe. There is no law against reading the crazy, apocalyptic insanity promulgated by ISIS here in the US.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 18th, 2015 at 2:21 AM

Title: Re: No means No

Content:

boda said:

...you should have explained me better sooner.

Malcolm wrote:

I did. A long time ago.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 18th, 2015 at 1:28 AM

Title: Re: No means No

Content:

amanitamusc said:

How are are you trying to help Malcolm boda?

Are you testing his patients ?

boda said:

For now I'd like to help him stop repeating himself.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, stop blaming others for your own lack of clarity, then I will stop.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 18th, 2015 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

TKF said:

Pure spiritual traditions have to be free from politics because a spiritual life cannot be motivated by worldly concerns. Many spiritual traditions espouse meditation on death to overcome worldly concerns, and politics is worldly, so there is no place where Dharma and politics meet.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, you are being naive.

smcj said:

He may be naive, but he is technically correct. In this respect I am naive as well, but to a slightly lesser degree. (The Gelug emphasis on Lam Rim that I have in common with TKF are showing here.) The way I see it "pure spiritual traditions" is almost an oxymoron. Once money, power and prestige come into play with the creation of institutions, the 8 worldly dharmas begin to intrude. One of the reasons that I'm a fan of 12 step programs is that they have made a serious attempt at defusing 6 out of the 8 worldly dharmas. By that I mean that, according to their own bylaws, nobody is supposed to be able to make money, become famous, or pull power trips (+ or -) on anybody else. Unfortunately that leaves sex in the mix, and even Bill W. "13th stepped" a lot of women.

What is not an oxymoron is a "pure spiritual practice". That is an individual thing, and it can be done in any environment. It is possible to be on retreat and have your mind filled with motivations of money, sex, power and prestige. Or you can be like HHDL who was born into power and prestige and yet is unaffected by it. So no, on the level of the individual I don't think it is overly naive, but certainly not a given either. If you don't believe me just try it. And TKF is right; that is what the meditation on death is for. Most of us usually just toss it because it reminds us of Christianity.

Malcolm wrote:

He is being naive because there is no samsara without nirvana, and no nirvana without samsara. There is no such a thing as a pure spiritual tradition that exists outside the world. The idea that spiritual traditions should eschew worldly concerns is morally bankrupt, in my opinion, it is a form of impractical utopianism. It is from his utopian stance that he took up the banner of criticizing HHDL for advocating secular ethics to begin with. He does not, and you do not here, seem to understand that it is precisely the

world that we have that creates the fertile swamp in which the lotus flower of the Dharma can blossom. Secular ethics in a liberal society give those lotuses the room they need to grow, because you can be sure they will not blossom at all in a fundamentalist Hindu, Jewish, Muslim or Christian society.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 17th, 2015 at 11:11 PM

Title: Re: Multiple terrorist attacks in Paris - Hostage situation

Content:

gloriasteinem said:

It is that you prefer to be compassionate and loving towards muslim refugees and not fellow Buddhists who suffer from them. Of course it is a matter of choice. Obama himself is mostly muslim, quoting of Quran and refusing Christian celebrations, he also refused refugee status prior to christian refugees of Syria but prefers such of muslim origin.

Malcolm wrote:

Umm, no. You have been misinformed. Obama is Christian, attends a Christian church, the Evergreen Chapel, at Camp David. He attends the Protestant service.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 17th, 2015 at 11:07 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

The separation of Dharma and politics is a value that comes from Dharma...

Malcolm wrote:

You are quite mistaken and naive here.

Tsongkhapafan said:

...because a Dharma that is motivated by politics is not Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

This statement contradicts the above statement. Why?, because the imperative to separate Dharma from politics is primarily a political imperative, not a spiritual one. History, including that of Tibet, is filled with examples of Kings who imposed religions on the populace.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Pure spiritual traditions have to be free from politics because a spiritual life cannot be motivated by worldly concerns. Many spiritual traditions espouse meditation on death to overcome worldly concerns, and politics is worldly, so there is no place where

Dharma and politics meet.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, you are being naive.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Freedoms have to be enshrined in law because we are deluded beings and the likelihood of being able to practice moral discipline is small but that's no substitute for genuine spirituality.

Malcolm wrote:

Freedoms have to be enshrined in laws because this is how people's rights are guaranteed. And not everyone wants a "spirituality", genuine or otherwise.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Laws are political, a completely different thing to Dharma.

Malcolm wrote:

Laws are social, not merely political. Dharma also has politics. It is not good to bury your head in the sand.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Secular ethics can be promoted by judges, the police and politicians, it doesn't need to be promoted by Spiritual Teachers who have a more important job to do in spreading genuine spirituality.

Malcolm wrote:

Religious teachers need to promote secular ethics as well. For example, one of the reasons there is a clash between the Muslim world and the West is that there are so many variations in religious Islamic law. The obvious solution to me is that Muslim religious leaders should support the open secular society in their countries as the best way to safeguard their own freedom to worship Allah as they see fit. It is for this reason that it is vitally important that spiritual teachers and secularists come together in agreement over common secular ethics so that EVERYONE can live in harmony and at the same time practice whatever spiritual tradition they want.

Your solution is a kind of religious isolationism — fine if you're Amish, but then, the Amish are disappearing, since they are not integrated into the larger US society.

Tsongkhapafan said:

If everyone practises a genuine spiritual path there is no need to enshrine ethical values in law because people will practise moral discipline.

Malcolm wrote:

But the only genuine path you recognize is Buddhism. So, your view is as impractical as it is utopian.

There will never be a time on this planet when all people follow the Dharma just as there has never been a time on this planet when all people followed the Dharma.

Therefore, the realistic and practical alternative to your pie in the sky utopianism is the further development of the liberal secular state based on the principle of a democratic, open society. Actually, you and the people who think like you are making a huge mistake by deriding secular ethics. Why?, because the Dharma will have its best chance to touch the lives of many people in precisely the kind of open, liberal society I am advocating.

Tsongkhapa said:

You can argue that only those who possess the eight freedoms and ten endowments have the opportunity to practise Dharma but there may be many such people who have the potential to practise but cannot at the moment because they don't have access to a centre or to a Teacher, so we should try to provide that opportunity in my view and encourage people to find real solutions to their problems.

Malcolm wrote:

All sentient beings have the potential to practice Dharma, merely because they are sentient beings. But part of the 18 qualifications of a human birth is access to Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 17th, 2015 at 10:19 PM

Title: Re: The Buddha's Jihad! :D

Content:

DGA said:

"left wing liberal" is a strawman. It's also a contradiction in terms, at least in the context of US politics. "left wing" means ending capitalism. "liberal" means reducing state intervention--this is why the Clintons make such good bedfellows with Wall Street. One wants to privatize the economy; the other seeks to end private control over social and economic life. These are completely different objectives.

Paul said:

"Liberal" has changed meaning over time, especially in the US. It's usually taken to mean a combination of left wing economics with social liberalism. Isn't this completely common knowledge?

Malcolm wrote:

The reason why I say that there is no "liberal elite" is that quite frankly, there isn't one. It is a Fox News trigger word, meant to shut down the frontal lobe of its viewers, place them in a hypnotic state, in order to prepare them for being conditioned by talking points they want to shovel into the minds of their viewers.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 17th, 2015 at 9:55 PM

Title: Re: No External Objects

Content:

Matt J said:

Maybe to go further, I will summarize my understanding of Mipham.

First, all we know of the external world are appearances in the mind.

Second, we infer common objects because we compare appearances with other minds. However, Mipham points out a few problems with this. First, we are using subjective impressions, which differ, to establish something that does not differ, i.e. external objects. There is a logical contradiction in using subjective impressions to prove objective objects. In addition, external objects are not appearances (they cause appearances), so they can be never known. If they can never be known, why posit it in the first place?

So instead of saying that there is a common external world, we say there are common karmic seeds.

I agree with Mipham but it doesn't seem to establish no external objects, it just makes me agnostic. Who knows what is beyond appearances? Maybe something, maybe nothing. Although, maybe this is his point--- even though he uses Chittamatra arguments, in the end he is a Madhyamika.

Malcolm wrote:

Your conclusion is known Tibetan tenet systems as "the half-eggest" Yogacara approach.

The general consensus is that the most profound Yogacara system, that of Ratnakarashanti, is the false aspectarian system, in which indeed, all external appearances are merely the activation of common and specific traces in our mindstreams.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 17th, 2015 at 9:40 PM

Title: Re: The Buddha's Jihad! :D

Content:

Rita_Repulsa said:

This is odd, but the intertwining of Buddhism with left wing liberal politics in the US seems to have something to do with the fact that it first came with Asian immigrants to our Pacific Coast. It spread into the mainstream from there alongside everything else we associate with the culture and politics of that region. This has "poisoned the well" for many when it comes to Dharma, and there are many who seek it out but ultimately give it up because of the interpretations of it they find available.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dharma first gained its currency among those who had experience in the Civil Rights and Anti-War movements in the 1950's and 1960's. This is one reason why

Dharma attracts many people of progressive values, whether or not Asian Buddhists actually share or possessed those values.

Rita_Repulsa said:

For our liberal elites, Dharma seems to be this cool toy that can be wielded against hinterland dwellers for extra gravitas in an argument.

Malcolm wrote:

What liberal elites? There is no such thing.

Rita_Repulsa said:

Our elites, on the other hand, won't defend Dharma...

Malcolm wrote:

Frankly, this is just empty rhetoric. You have no idea what you are talking about, and you also have no experience "defending" the Dharma against anyone or anything.

Rita_Repulsa said:

Dharma is a treasure. It's worth defending...

Malcolm wrote:

The Buddha pointed out in one sūtra that the Dharma can never be destroyed from outside, but only from inside. All of this sturm and drung about defending the Dharma from some imaginary outside foe is simply deluded.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 17th, 2015 at 9:16 PM

Title: Re: Multiple terrorist attacks in Paris - Hostage situation

Content:

Kim O'Hara said:

Obama hasn't given in to the fear-mongers:

<http://www.upworthy.com/3-things-president-obama-said-about-refugees-that-we-all-need-to-hear>

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

Of course, the governors of those US states claiming they won't accept refugees are just blathering on in ignorance. In reality, states within the US cannot close their borders to any persons residing in or visiting the US. When the Federal Gvt. processes those Syrian refugees, they will settle them wherever they like.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 17th, 2015 at 8:15 PM

Title: Re: No means No

Content:

boda said:

Is there a forum rule about not mixing thought with questions?

Malcolm wrote:

No, but there is a general consensus that if you do not write clearly, you can't very well expect the blame lies with others if they do not understand you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 17th, 2015 at 10:42 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ummmm... have you looked at the state of the world today?

Tsongkhapafan said:

Yes, I see a world that need Dharma, not feel good platitudes. I rest my case.

Malcolm wrote:

Do you see that most humans lack the 18 qualifications that constitute a precious human birth?

Case closed.

By the way, secular ethics are not "feel good" platitudes. Secular ethics are necessary in order to negotiate fairness and justice between different peoples of different faiths and political orientations.

Let me give you an example. A number of years ago I was attending a conference at Smith College on Mongolia. As you know, Mongolia is a country where there are a large number of people who follow the practice of Dorje Shugden. A friend of my introduced me to the Secretary General of the Mongolian Consulate to the United States, because he was quite concerned about the Dorje Shugden practice, and felt that is was a large problem in his country. After discussing various problems with the practice and its history, he asked me point blank if Mongolia shouldn't just outlaw the practice. I asked him whether or not Mongolia has a law on the books about freedom of religion, and indeed it does. I pointed out to him that in this case, a country which believes in separation of Church and State cannot be involved in banning this or that religion. You will be shocked to learn that I said to him that this kind of policy could not happen in Mongolia, that the Mongolian Gvt. would be wrong to ban Shugden practice because they value religious freedom and so forth. He was not terribly happy with my answer, but

he understood it.

You see, the point is that is an instance of secular ethics, the separation of church and state are vital to everyone's freedom. A liberal open society requires a firm grounding in secular ethics for the benefit of everyone. Secular ethics are the foundation of the liberal state, they are the foundation of any open society. Thus, even though I personally think the practice of Dorje Shugden is harmful and deeply misguided, by the same token, in a liberal state, an open society, I have no choice but to accept that there are those who wish to perform this practice because of their religious beliefs.

You yourself invoked a separation of Dharma and politics. This is not a value that comes from the Dharma, this is a secular value, which finds its roots in the establishment clause of the first amendment of the US Constitution. Your and my best hope for religious freedom, economic wellbeing and justice is based precisely on the very secular ethics you are deriding. In other words, when you live in a pluralistic, diverse society like the US and Europe, one has no choice but to develop a strong and robust framework of secular ethics. It is absolutely necessary for everyone's wellbeing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 17th, 2015 at 7:50 AM

Title: Re: No means No

Content:

boda said:

DGA appears to understand my interest. Maybe he's the forum telepath.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, after I pointed out that you did not ask a clear question that you wanted answered.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 17th, 2015 at 4:58 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

tomschwarz said:

tsongkhapafan wants all to have access to the Dharma. that is a truly beautiful wish. I think we all need to go to your meditation class))))))

Malcolm wrote:

We all want everyone to have access to Dharma. Some of us understand that this is not going to happen, and mostly because most humans do not have a precious human birth.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 17th, 2015 at 4:56 AM

Title: Re: No means No

Content:

DGA said:

boda, I'll try to address your interest in the matter of seeming self-indulgence that isn't really in the context of the precepts.

What seems to happen seems to happen because of the afflictions of people. I see things the way I do--things seem to me the way they seem--because of my own conditioning, karma, problems, hangups, whatever. So I see someone take an action that may seem outrageous to me and I make certain assumptions about it, and have a certain kind of response. Where do those assumptions come from?

For example, there's a precept against harsh speech. OK, fine. One day I saw a teacher I respect very much shouting instructions VERY VERY LOUDLY AND DIRECTLY AND NOT POLITELY VERY HARSHLY HOLY MOLY at a student. It wasn't just a scolding. The teacher really ripped him a new one. Now, someone who witnessed this burst into tears. Why? Because she had grown up with an abusive father, and couldn't understand why anyone would resort to the methods of an abusive father like that. Someone else thought it was funny and had to stifle a laugh. And the person on the receiving end? Just apologized meekly and went on with his life in clear repose. That teacher clearly broke the precepts in a way that looked careless and, well, self-indulgent. It would have been harder to simply pull the student aside and have the "Hey now, we need to talk" conversation. Instead he just popped off and made an example out of the poor sap.

We later found out that the whole thing was a pre-arranged stunt to teach someone else a completely different lesson. It was Dharma theater, and it worked like a charm to break that third party of a pernicious habit. Now, was the response of the person who started crying true or false? Did the teacher really break the precept?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, today we should have provided a trigger warning, and made sure there was a "safe space."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 17th, 2015 at 4:23 AM

Title: Re: No means No

Content:

boda said:

I wrote "Besides those thoughts, I was wondering..." Besides means 'in addition to'. And had you read further my interests may have been clearer, or you may have just ignored what I wrote, or you didn't care to give it your full attention. Who knows.

Malcolm wrote:

A thought is not a question. What I observed was that everyone addressed your

question, a few people tried to address your thoughts, but you castigated them for not addressing your question. If you don't write more clearly, people will not be able to answer you very well. It is your responsibility to communicate clearly, it is not our responsibility to guess at what you want in reply.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 17th, 2015 at 1:23 AM

Title: Re: No means No

Content:

BrianG said:

I will answer your question for the Nth time, hopefully this will clarify.

If the situation requires it, and it will benefit sentient beings, a Bodhisattva must break the precepts.

Which part of this is confusing to you?

boda said:

I suppose the confusing part is that no one is responding to what I'm actually asking about. And I've been explicitly clear about what I'm asking about.

Malcolm wrote:

The only question in your OP is:

I was wondering what else is okay for the advance practitioner besides intoxicants. Is lying, stealing, killing and sexual abuse also okay for the advanced practitioner? Is there a line and how do you determine it?

So, if no one is answering the question you intended to ask, it is because you did not ask a question apart from the one above. Many people have answered the question you actually asked. Mind reading is hard enough without having to try and do it over the internet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 16th, 2015 at 11:23 PM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

TKF thinks we ought to be standing on street corners evangelizing the Dharma.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Malcolm is setting up a strawman because he doesn't agree with his idea about my views, which he misrepresents.

Malcolm wrote:

Huh, I don't agree with my own ideas? Ok.

Tsongkhapafan said:

I have never said that we should evangelise Dharma, what I have said is that Dharma should be readily available for those who are able to practise it and anyone with compassion would want to make it available, in an appropriate situation, for example by holding and advertising Buddhist meditation classes.

Malcolm wrote:

It is.

Tsongkhapafan said:

It seems to me that Teachers like the Dalai Lama have such a great opportunity, so selling secular ethics instead of genuine Dharma is selling people short as these will not lead to liberation and enlightenment.

Malcolm wrote:

He is not "selling" secular ethics. The HHDL regularly gives advertised Dharma teachings in the West. He also understands, however, that a liberal society, based on secular democratic ideals, is the best way humans being have to get along with each other. Not everyone is interested in Buddhist ideas of enlightenment.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Any one can teach that we should be nice to people, it's a no brainer. What people need are methods to develop their love, compassion and wisdom, not just to be told that we should be more compassionate.

Malcolm wrote:

Ummmm... have you looked at the state of the world today?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 16th, 2015 at 9:57 PM

Title: Re: OT posts from "Multiple terrorist attacks in Paris"

Content:

philji said:

Can the heading of this thread be changed as it is misleading.. I cannot find one post about the Paris attacks????

Malcolm wrote:

OT means off topic...

Anyway, we are apparently not permitted to voice any comments about Islam itself, since all such critical comments will apparently be regarded as hate speech. But perhaps the mods will let this Muslim woman speak to the issues:

```
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]

Or this one:

Ayaan Hirsi Ali (@Ayaan) | Twitter

<https://twitter.com/Ayaan>

1 day ago As long as Muslims say IS has nothing to with Islam or talk of Islamophobia they are not ready to reform their faith.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 16th, 2015 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Anarchist Buddhist teachers, present and past?

Content:

tingdzin said:

A society with no state control was as much out of the question in 1930s Europe as it is today.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, the idea of the absence of a state is frankly ridiculous. It is not like we are going to return to hunter-gather bands. One interesting trend to emerge from the anarchists in general however is Bookchin's Libertarian Municipalism — the platform of the Kurdish P.K.K., amazingly enough.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 16th, 2015 at 8:46 PM

Title: Re: Anarchist Buddhist teachers, present and past?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Anti-state = incoherent and poorly thought out.

tingdzin said:

Buddhists have no business getting romantic notions about any political ideology.

Malcolm wrote:

I agree, to a point — but where I disagree is that I feel Dharma practitioners should support the modern liberal state along lines I have elsewhere outlined, and should be deeply engaged in the Environmental movement.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 16th, 2015 at 7:59 PM

Title: Re: Multiple terrorist attacks in Paris - Hostage situation

Content:

Karma Dorje said:

You won't find those purported 60% of Thai men quoting Buddhist scripture to support what they are doing. This has to do with Thai culture, not Buddhist culture.

Tenso said:

You sure about that?

A conqueror, a water channel, a creeping plant,
Women and the blind, these five,
How they are led by the crafty!
And this leading places them in the power of others.

182. A woman's appetite is twice (that of a man),
Her deceitfulness four times (as much),
Her shame six times,
And her passions eight times--so it is said.

194. When milk is got from a horn,
When the reed-flower drops honey,
Then, when a woman is true,
The lotus will grow in dry ground.

246. An evil man, gold, a drum,
A wild horse, women and cloth
Are controlled by beating.
These are not vessels for elegant doings.]
<http://www.sacred-texts.com/bud/srdb/srdb.htm>

Malcolm wrote:

Surely not one of Nagarjuna's high points. Buddhism too has some work to do in terms of ridding itself of adharmic sexism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 16th, 2015 at 10:42 AM

Title: Re: Multiple terrorist attacks in Paris - Hostage situation

Content:

dreambow said:

Malcolm, 'Quite frankly, these are all side issues. The real issue, the core of the whole thing, is women's rights. And in general, most Muslims don't believe in this' This mechanical declaration is based on group think and its quite untrue. The terrorist attacks are so much more complex and multi layered then this flat, politically correct statement.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is based on having looked at what groups like ISIS actually say about the West, why they hate us, and the sheer amount of energy they spend oppressing women.

And, also frankly, most Muslim women are in subjugation. They do not enjoy the freedom that women in liberalized societies like ours do.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 16th, 2015 at 6:43 AM

Title: Re: Multiple terrorist attacks in Paris - Hostage situation

Content:

MiphamFan said:

Why only women's rights?

Malcolm wrote:

Because that is what they hate most about the West. They hate the fact that women in the west are not slaves of men. They basically hate women.

BrianG said:

Besides Saudis I haven't really noticed that. Indonesia is the most populous Muslim country, I've never noticed anything overly misogynistic about the people.

The criticism about "Muslims oppressing women" could easily be applied to Buddhist cultures. 60% of Thai men think it's ok to beat women. I have heard similar things about Tibetan men.

Regardless, I don't think women's rights are responsible for the Paris attack. ISIS is doing exactly what it has said it would - draw the west into the Middle East.

Malcolm wrote:

I said before this:

Women's rights, from over the control of their bodies to their ability to live free of control of men and so on are the main thing that fundamentalists hate, whether Christian, Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, etc.

You have to look at WHY they want to draw the West into a total war. It has everything to do with the slow, inexorable, dismantling of patriarchal power.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 16th, 2015 at 6:03 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism without Buddhism

Content:

Wayfarer said:

Isn't it more the case that secular philosophy often defines itself in such a way to distinguish itself from what it understands as religious thinking. So that often manifests

as the criticism of what it sees as being religious elements that have appeared in Buddhism. In that view, of Bachelor and others, the original form was more like today's secular humanism, before it became associated with ideas from the surrounding culture, of which belief in rebirth was a key one.

dharmagoat said:

Overlooking, it seems, that the Buddha did actually teach rebirth himself. The question remains whether the Buddha taught rebirth as an expedient. It is a question that has no satisfactory answer.

Malcolm wrote:

It has a satisfactory answer — the answer is no. Buddha taught the existence of four kinds of realized persons defined by how many lifetimes it would take them to attain nirvana.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 16th, 2015 at 5:29 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

This is why secular ethics is selling people short and we should make every effort to get Dharma to those who can practise it.

dharmagoat said:

You seem to be giving the impression that secular ethics and Buddhist ethics are mutually exclusive.

Aren't secular ethics a subset of Buddhist ethics?

Malcolm wrote:

TKF thinks we ought to be standing on street corners evangelizing the Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 16th, 2015 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: Flight of the Garuda

Content:

asunthatneversets said:

Tony Duff has one too.

Malcolm wrote:

I also have one. It will be published in due course.

swooping said:

Do you have any books that are currently available?

Is there a website or mailing list to here about new releases?

Malcolm wrote:
Wisdom is publishing one of my books next year.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, November 16th, 2015 at 1:51 AM
Title: Re: Multiple terrorist attacks in Paris - Hostage situation
Content:
MiphamFan said:
Hmmm, I don't know, but I think hating women is a symptom, not a root cause.

They hate that other systems of values can exist without Allah mainly.

Western women converts often say they feel more respect under Islam for femininity.

Malcolm wrote:
This is because these women have been brainwashed. Women's rights are at the forefront of liberal values in the modern western world, when you attack those, you are attacking the very foundation of upon which the rights movement is presently built on. Women's rights, from over the control of their bodies to their ability to live free of control of men and so on are the main thing that fundamentalists hate, whether Christian, Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, etc. Women's rights are basic to all rights human beings enjoy. You may not see it this way now, but if you think about long enough, you will see that this whole thing between the Muslim world, and our fundamentalists at home is a result of the West's clumsily and blindly lurching beyond patriarchy.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Monday, November 16th, 2015 at 12:12 AM
Title: Re: Multiple terrorist attacks in Paris - Hostage situation
Content:
MiphamFan said:
Why only women's rights?

Malcolm wrote:
Because that is what they hate most about the West. They hate the fact that women in the west are not slaves of men. They basically hate women.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Sunday, November 15th, 2015 at 11:11 PM
Title: Re: Multiple terrorist attacks in Paris - Hostage situation
Content:
Kim O'Hara said:
[
That's true, of course, but how far back should we look?

I looked back about a century, and I think that's far enough for most purposes because it has the strongest impact on our present. It covers the lived history of everyone alive today, and most of the histories they heard from parents and grandparents.

Kim

Malcolm wrote:

Quite frankly, these are all side issues. The real issue, the core of the whole thing, is women's rights. And in general, most Muslims don't believe in this.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 15th, 2015 at 10:54 PM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

maybay said:

If whenever someone says something you have no answer to you say it is not what you are talking about, then you must have no shortage of irrelevancies. No doubt this was also irrelevant.

Malcolm wrote:

I could have answered, but it is a waste of time, because your whole statement was irrelevant.

maybay said:

I am sure it applies to the object of critique, if we are open to debating it.

Malcolm wrote:

It does not apply, because I was not recommending any of the things Dudjom Rinpoche was criticizing.

maybay said:

She wasn't deluded on that count, they were trying to discredit him.

Malcolm wrote:

The point is that there is no substance in your criticisms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 15th, 2015 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: No means No

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

Funny -- I was just reading a <https://bhikkhucintita.wordpress.com/home/blog/> by Bhikkhu Cintita, a Theravadin monk, on the topic of ethics. He writes:

The weaknesses of precepts as guides to ethical conduct are that they...don't permit appropriate exceptions, that is, precepts are porous and rigid. There is the case in

which the Gestapo shows up at our front door and asks us, gleefully aware that a Buddhist will not lie, if we are hiding Jews in the attic, or that in which one of us just happens to be returning from a softball game with a bat in his hand and walk in right behind a man who has just “gone postal” and is about to embark on taking out fellow employees. There are, moreover, many harmful, generally mildly harmful, behaviors that simply are not covered in precepts, like taking up two parking spaces.

Nonetheless, it is significant that the Buddha rarely sanctioned exceptions to precepts to correct their rigidity. I suspect this is because he wanted us to be fully aware of, and live with, the contradictory nature of the human condition rather than regulating it away. How do you think a good Buddhist should behave in the kinds of situations he mentions?

Malcolm wrote:

It is pretty obvious — you lie to the Gestapo and strike down the man who is killing others with the bat. This is proper Buddhist response. Any other response is irresponsible.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 15th, 2015 at 3:24 AM

Title: Re: Merit -- how would you explain this?

Content:

smcj said:

For example, in order to destroy the world, kill millions of Jews and so on, Hitler had to have had great merit to rise to such power; the same can be said of Stalin and Mao. I don't think that is right.

Malcolm wrote:

You would be wrong.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 15th, 2015 at 3:21 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

maybay said:

Zooming into the details you hope to distract from the bigger picture of falling morality and a Dharma in decline...

Malcolm wrote:

Now you pretend to know my inner motivations? Shame on you for being so presumptuous.

maybay said:

One cannot take the lives of disembodied beings. Sorry, it is just not possible. It doesn't matter. The point is not to take what you think is life, just as actions in a dream

bare karmic fruit.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course it matters, if you are being accurate and truthful. Something you supposedly hold as a value.

maybay said:

It is not possible to take responsibility for anyone's behavior but one's own. One cannot control what others do, nor should one try, unless those persons are acting out of bounds of law or parental authority.

By living with people, by choosing a certain profession, a certain employment, a city, by associating on an Internet forum, with a Gar about to go bureaucratic, you are effectively endorsing them. It is unavoidable that you as an ignorant sentient being, should be affected by their actions and they by yours, because unless you have seen through the illusion of your individuality you will be subject to that shared experience.

Malcolm wrote:

This is irrelevant. You like to bring in irrelevancies, I have noticed.

maybay said:

I have not asked anyone to abandon anything.

Noted, but the word I used was provoke.

Malcolm wrote:

I have not provoked anyone either.

maybay said:

This does not apply to what I am saying.

This is unfortunate. There is no better way to establish authority than through the writings of a master.

Malcolm wrote:

When using an authority, you should make sure it applies to the object of your critique. Otherwise, you will waste a lot of time writing things that miss the side of the barn, much less hit a small target.

maybay said:

For example, while some people, because they are either foolish or blind, may require a fence to protect them from falling over the edge of a cliff; other people do not require such safety measures.

Perhaps, but for you to say so. Your example conjures up images of a jaded outcast walking a knife-edge existence. Is this your medicine for people?

Malcolm wrote:

I can't help what fantasies you conjure in your own mind.

maybay said:

One has to understand the essence of the teachings, not adhere to outer forms.

This does not speak of a balanced view. It comes across as reactionary, myopic.

Malcolm wrote:

I can't help your perceptions — even the Buddha was accused by a desperate women of making her pregnant. All I can do is point out that under your dress is a trough, not a child.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 15th, 2015 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: Merit -- how would you explain this?

Content:

pael said:

Does dedication mean dedicating without wishing reward?

Malcolm wrote:

It means dedicating by understanding that the merit, the recipient of merit and the dedication are all ultimate empty.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 15th, 2015 at 1:51 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

smcj said:

Vows can also be crutches for the weak minded, who are actually able to walk without their support.

One has to understand the essence of the teachings, not adhere to outer forms.

That's a somewhat Nyingma type perspective. Most Nyingma lamas are not monks. The more monastic sects of Vajrayana do not necessarily agree. HHK 16 was a monk that kept his vows. He was not "weak-minded".

Malcolm wrote:

SMCJ, he was an ārya on the stages, or so many people believe. Such people are simply incapable of breaking their vows at all, so how can they "keep" them? What they do is represent the principle of holding vows, but in reality their conduct is beyond holding vows.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 15th, 2015 at 1:00 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

maybay said:

If vows are so elementary then why do you provoke practitioners to abandon them?

Malcolm wrote:

I have not asked anyone to abandon anything.

maybay said:

Dudjom Rinpoche:

Malcolm wrote:

This does not apply to what I am saying.

maybay said:

And from Counsels from my heart:

The teachings say therefore that we should avoid one-sided attitudes regarding the view and action. Like eagles soaring in space, we should be clearly convinced of the view, but at the same time we should heed the karmic principle of cause and effect, as finely as if we were sifting flour.

As Buddhists, we rely on the teachings of the Buddha, and must therefore have heartfelt confidence in the supreme Dharma. Whoever we are, we need to have a good heart, sincere and without deceit. At all times and on all occasions, we must maintain an irreversible trust in the sacred Dharma, and our minds must be steady and constant. These three things are our firm foundation: steady faith, sincere devotion, and constancy. Furthermore, whatever the Dharma contains, it is all Buddha's teaching. We must therefore have pure perception and an appreciation of all Dharma traditions, those of others as much as our own. We must respect them all.

Malcolm wrote:

This also does not apply to what I am saying.

maybay said:

Not committing evil acts is one thing, but making a commitment to that way of life is another. We are not mindful all the time and mistakes happen. This is why Buddha explains right effort

Malcolm wrote:

One does not need a vow to have such a commitment.

For example, while some people, because they are either foolish or blind, may require a fence to protect them from falling over the edge of a cliff; other people do not require such safety measures.

maybay said:

A vow is actually a pretty simple way to remind us of that possibility, that humanness and vulnerability even, and it promotes a sense of communal identity and allows one to

develop confidence and understanding for holding more strenuous vows.

Malcolm wrote:

Some people understand that śīla has nothing to do with vows and pledges. Other people don't.

maybay said:

Vows are a corrective for weak minds, and they are almost an expectation of those coming from other religions who still expect the same signs of legitimacy.

Malcolm wrote:

Vows can also be crutches for the weak minded, who are actually able to walk without their support.

One has to understand the essence of the teachings, not adhere to outer forms.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 11:13 PM

Title: Re: Pointing Out through Appearances

Content:

Wayfarer said:

Quite right! Actually I picked up a copy of a really interesting but dense book by Jay Garfield, <http://amzn.com/0195146727>, which has a lot of these ideas. It's starting to come together for me. I don't see any major contradiction between some of those 'idealist' elements in Western philosophy and the mind-only approach, except the latter is firmly grounded in meditation and not just conceptual analysis. But it does help to join the dots, so to speak. Which in one of the reasons I am very grateful to Dharmawheel Forum and its learned contributors.

Malcolm wrote:

Jay is in the same philosophy department as my father [Smith College].

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 11:10 PM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, four of the five lay precepts are just based on all three physical non-virtues and one of the nonvirtues of speech. If you need a vow not to kill things, engage in inappropriate sexual conduct, steal and lie that does not say very much for your moral character, does it?

BrianG said:

But morality, if you define it as training in, engaging in wholesome actions, and

abstaining from unwholesome ones, does require precepts. At least according to my interpretation of Sakya Pandita's Distinguishing The Three Vows.

Malcolm wrote:

If you subscribe to an excessively legalistic frame of mind, i.e., the one characterized by late Indian and 13th--15th century Tibetan thinking about the three vows, perhaps. According to their argument taking a vow of not killing makes both your practice of not killing and the act of killing stronger. There is some truth to this, but only in the sense that a vow indicates a strong resolve.

So, if you are already have a strong resolve not to take life, for what reason do you need a vow not to do so? Please recall, there was no Vinaya in the beginning, the first five monks had no vows per se. The Vinaya gradually grew slowly as Buddha tried to deal with misbehaving monks causing problems.

The fact is that all three vows are scholastic constructions.

The three vows can also summarized into three principles: cause no harm; help sentient beings; cultivate pure vision. If one is following these three principles, then you are training śīla.

Otherwise, a monk with all 251 vows can be a very harmful person, refuse to help sentient beings, and have completely impure vision, and nevertheless keep their 251 vows perfectly — is this really training in śīla? Of course not.

On the other hand a lay person who has gone for refuge but feels they cannot follow the five precepts, such a person can actually practice ahimsa, help sentient beings and cultivate pure vision. Such a person I would say is actually training in śīla.

maybay said:

There are many examples of spirit beings we don't ordinarily pay attention to.

Malcolm wrote:

One cannot take the lives of disembodied beings. Sorry, it is just not possible.

maybay said:

Or your response to someone else killing sentient beings is an automatic distancing from them, instead of sharing the responsibility for their conduct and feeling remorse.

Malcolm wrote:

Why should one share responsibility for someone else's actions? For example, when someone sells crack on the corner, I don't feel it is my responsibility at all, nor should I, nor should you.

maybay said:

Then what is the threshold at which you recognize your own greedy consumption as depriving others of property? Stealing is not always so clear cut.

Malcolm wrote:

Stealing is pretty well defined as taking that of which some other human person claims ownership. Unfortunately, Buddhist ethics does not count the feelings of animals and other small creatures when it comes to "property." If it did, farming would be impossible.

maybay said:

You say you don't lie. But lying is about deception and misrepresentation. Hiding the truth is effectively lying.

Malcolm wrote:

Lying is the intention to deceive someone.

maybay said:

Acting contrary to convention, like entering a house through a window, could be seen as deceitful, even if you know the owner well.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if you intend to deceive someone.

maybay said:

They say the Buddha would never speak to you at an angle. He would always turn to face you like an elephant. Even with our eyes and our handshake we can lie.

Malcolm wrote:

Only if you intend to deceive someone.

maybay said:

Sexual misconduct is more deception, against others, and against your inhibitions.

Malcolm wrote:

No, not at all. First of all, these "inhibitions" are largely cultural, which is why they vary so much from one culture to another. Secondly, sexual misconduct is clearly defined as sexual activity which is exploitative, such as sex with minors and the ill; sexual acts which damage social contracts, such as marriage; and sexual acts which are seen as inappropriate or indolent, such as sex in shrines or during the day; and sexual acts which are seen as physically unhealthy, such as oral and anal sex. It is a physical act that is being censured.

maybay said:

Which brings us to intoxication, with substances, with ideas, worldly activities, plans. Shameless intoxication that precludes mindfulness.

Malcolm wrote:

Intoxication is confined to becoming intoxicating substances.

maybay said:

There is infinite depth to the precepts. For the sake of ritualizing them they are iconified.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the five precepts are just Hinayāna vows. They are very simple, something relative, and something which do not apply at all times and in all circumstances.

maybay said:

Second point, morality is a group effort.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it is an individual practice.

maybay said:

There is wholesome behaviour, assurances of loyalty to wholesome behavior that calms the fears and the passions others, and censure and punitive action against immorality.

Malcolm wrote:

Again, this is all very subjective. You are just making a case for colonialism: for example, the Victorian redesign of the sari, because the Victorian English were both titillated and offended by women's breasts.

maybay said:

It's impossible not to take responsibility for other's behavior to at least some degree.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not possible to take responsibility for anyone's behavior but one's own. One cannot control what others do, nor should one try, unless those persons are acting out of bounds of law or parental authority.

maybay said:

We are not moral citadels in the world.

Malcolm wrote:

We need only to take responsibility for ourselves. That's it.

maybay said:

Of course, liberality is emphasised at times. Anyone who has something to sell another person will begin by highlighting their sovereignty of choice in the matter. It's your choice to do anything from buy our Pepsi to practice our Dharma. What is really being said is that you should forget your prior commitment, loyalties, savings etc. So when they ask Dalai Lama what is the best religion, he tells them. Yours.

Malcolm wrote:

I think you need to get out more.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 10:43 PM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Well, four of the five lay precepts are just based on all three physical non-virtues and one of the nonvirtues of speech. If you need a vow not to kill things, engage in inappropriate sexual conduct, steal and lie that does not say very much for your moral character, does it?

smcj said:

Really? By that way of thinking you would come to the conclusion that HHK 16, Deshung R. and HHDL to all have been of inferior moral character.

Malcolm wrote:

Do you really think these three men needed vows to avoid such things?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 10:24 PM

Title: Re: Multiple terrorist attacks in Paris - Hostage situation

Content:

BrianG said:

The president of France called it an act of war, and the Islamic State claimed responsibility, so this is the WW3 pre-game.

Malcolm wrote:

Worldly "logic" dictates a massive military response and reoccupation of Iraq, and now Syria.

In any case, our hearts should go out to all who are suffering from the terror of war and violence. It seems likely that more is on the way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 7:40 AM

Title: Re: Pointing Out through Appearances

Content:

Wayfarer said:

Because it highlights the difference between what a lot of people would take for granted about the reality of things, from the proposition that 'Whatever thing or being we perceive are concepts, mental fabrications.' I know, 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.

Malcolm wrote:

I see. Well, given that I was raised by a philosopher, you might want to drop the name "Berkeley" to those guys.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 5:46 AM

Title: Re: Pointing Out through Appearances

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This knowledge is meant to cut attachment to appearances as being real.

Wayfarer said:

Right - whereas for 'modern thought', only appearances are real.

Malcolm wrote:

What does that have to do with the question?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 3:49 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

maybay said:

The teacher is more important than your practice.

Malcolm wrote:

My guru wouldn't say so. Without practicing, a teacher is useless; like a doctor when the patient won't take the medicine.

maybay said:

I'd like to hear more about what your guru says.

Malcolm wrote:

You can listen to Chogyal Namkhai Norbu any time.

But my real point is that it is practitioners first and foremost who are the gatekeepers, or rather, more aptly (since gatekeepers sound like those who keep people out) stewards of the teachings.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 3:20 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

maybay said:

The teacher is more important than your practice.

Malcolm wrote:

My guru wouldn't say so. Without practicing, a teacher is useless; like a doctor when the patient won't take the medicine.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 3:00 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

maybay said:

Oh I'm sure of it. So where does that leave us now? How can we get on better with the gatekeepers of the Dharma, keep a pure perception of the Guru, and be mindful of our own faults rather than seeking error in others?

Malcolm wrote:

Maybay, everyone who is a practitioner is a "gatekeeper of the Dharma," not just Tibetans.

maybay said:

Not everyone who practices teaches.

Malcolm wrote:

Even so, they are gatekeepers of the Dharma. Practice is more important than teaching.

maybay said:

We need to respect realized persons, not people of this or that ethnic extraction. We need to respect all people, of whatever ethnic extraction. It wouldn't hurt to try understand them either. They would probably accept it as a great kindness on your part.

Malcolm wrote:

Given the amount of I have spent with Tibetans both in the West, and in Tibet and Nepal, learning their language, customs, sciences and religion, I am fairly sure I have a pretty good handle on who they are.

I respect whoever is worthy of respect. One does not have to earn my respect. Once my disrespect it earned however, it is difficult to restore my respect.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 2:18 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

maybay said:

Oh I'm sure of it. So where does that leave us now? How can we get on better with the gatekeepers of the Dharma, keep a pure perception of the Guru, and be mindful of our own faults rather than seeking error in others?

Malcolm wrote:

Maybay, everyone who is a practitioner is a "gatekeeper of the Dharma," not just Tibetans. We need to respect realized persons, not people of this or that ethnic extraction.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: having a drink

Content:

boda said:

We might judge from the example that no intoxicants is part of the path for good reason, simply.

Malcolm wrote:

Or we might judge from the example that we should not drive while drinking. Quite frankly, attitudes toward drinking differ considerably amongst Buddhists. What is appropriate and necessary for one person is not automatically appropriate and necessary for another.

For you, mindful drinking is not part of your path. For me, mindful drinking is included. For you, it is not possible drink and be mindful. That is your limitation. I don't have that limitation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: having a drink

Content:

boda said:

It's a sad day when we find the simple truth demonizing.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, the demonizing is not in the truth of things, but rather the judgements people make as a result, and their ensuing hysteria.

The simple truth is that Trungpa was in an accident cause by drinking too much. He was in great pain as a result. He drank to kill the pain. He eventually died from complications related to diabetes, high blood pressure and liver damage.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 1:11 AM
Title: Re: Flight of the Garuda
Content:
asunthatneversets said:
Tony Duff has one too.

Malcolm wrote:
I also have one. It will be published in due course.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 12:56 AM
Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism
Content:

tomschwarz said:
So the follow on question, is there liberation without Buddhism?

Malcolm wrote:
If one's error can be exhausted without the Dharma, then yes. If not, then no.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 12:46 AM
Title: Re: having a drink
Content:
Malcolm wrote:
ironic, isn't it?

boda said:
I was thinking more like not clear headed, and less generously, criminally irresponsible.

Malcolm wrote:
People like demonizing Trungpa. It has become something of an internet sport in Buddhist forums. Mostly it is jealousy.

If there is something to find offensive in Trungpa's behavior, it is the episode when he tried to shoot a bird. Of course he missed, having never handled a firearm, but...

oh hell, there is no end of potentially offensive things to find in Trungpa's bio...but at the end of the day, he was the most influential Buddhist teacher of the 1970's and 80's.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: Merit -- how would you explain this?

Content:

MiphamFan said:

So the function of conditioned and unconditioned merit is also different?

I.e. Conditioned merit can take one higher and higher in samsara, but does nothing directly for liberation. Unconditioned merit takes one along the paths and stages (in causal vehicle) but does not necessarily mean you will have a high position in samsara, in fact, you might be materially poor?

Malcolm wrote:

It is possible — I would rather be a poor person in the Dharma than a rich person who never heard of the Dharma. It all depends on what you define as "riches". In terms of Dharma riches, I am one of the wealthiest men in the West. Definitely part of the .001%. We all are.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 12:37 AM

Title: Re: having a drink

Content:

boda said:

Unfortunate for people like Chögyam Trungpa that this transmutation didn't turn the toxin into something that wasn't addictive, and didn't destroy the liver.

Malcolm wrote:

As far as Trungpa and drinking goes, people usually fail to observe the obvious — Trungpa was in intense pain all of the time from his accident. Alcohol was the only pain killer that left him clear minded. He accomplished what he needed to, then he died.

boda said:

Speaking of failing to observe the obvious, it's reported that the accident was caused by...

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, it was reported that was is the case, ironic, isn't it? People often burn their houses down while cooking, but no one suggests we should all cease cooking.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 12:29 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

maybay said:

Hurrah for Mahayana ethics. I reiterate, what good are Hinayana precepts if you feel no

shame in breaking them?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, four of the five lay precepts are just based on all three physical non-virtues and one of the nonvirtues of speech. If you need a vow not to kill things, engage in inappropriate sexual conduct, steal and lie that does not say very much for your moral character, does it?

maybay said:

What are you trying to say Malcolm. My point was clearly about the question of shame and the possibility of increasing understanding and sympathy with Tibetan teachers, in a very Mahayana manner I might add. But you seem to want an argument about stock standard precepts. Should I take a break from the forum do you think?

Malcolm wrote:

Here is your statement:

Just on the perception of Westerners by Tibetans and why they harp on about morality: If we appear shameless to Tibetans, then they assume we must lack morals. American Indians appeared shameless to Europeans. Should they have assumed, as they did, that American Indians lacked morals?

Tantric Buddhism appeared immoral to Victorian sensibilities. Should they have assumed, as they did, that Tantric Buddhism was immoral?

Maybe the problem lies with those are doing to the perceiving and not with the object they are perceiving.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 12:22 AM

Title: Re: Merit -- how would you explain this?

Content:

MiphamFan said:

So if one dedicates merit inexhaustibly it is not destroyed by an instant of anger?

Malcolm wrote:

No. Only conditioned merit is destroyed by anger.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 14th, 2015 at 12:15 AM

Title: Re: Merit -- how would you explain this?

Content:

paël said:

Where I can study/read about those three things which do not exist?

Malcolm wrote:

The Diamond Sūtra for one. The point is that mundane merit, exhaustible merit, is created by those who have no knowledge emptiness. This causes rebirth in higher realms, but that is all. Inexhaustible merit causes progress along the paths and stages, according to the view of the causal vehicle, and is a direct cause for realizing dharmakāya, again, according to the view of the causal vehicle.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 11:52 PM

Title: Re: Merit -- how would you explain this?

Content:

paël said:

How to dedicate before that happens?

Malcolm wrote:

You understand when you dedicate that these three things do not exist. It does not mean you have to be on the path of seeing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 11:46 PM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

maybay said:

Just on the perception of Westerners by Tibetans and why they harp on about morality: If we appear shameless to Tibetans, then they assume we must lack morals. What good are precepts if you feel no shame in breaking them and you're too obdurate to feel remorse? How could someone tell if you were moral? Isn't that important?

Malcolm wrote:

Morality does not lie in keeping precepts — this is the point, actually, of Mahāyāna ethics.

maybay said:

Hurrah for Mahayana ethics. I reiterate, what good are Hinayana precepts if you feel no shame in breaking them?

Malcolm wrote:

Well, four of the five lay precepts are just based on all three physical non-virtues and one of the nonvirtues of speech. If you need a vow not to kill things, engage in inappropriate sexual conduct, steal and lie that does not say very much for your moral character, does it?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 11:42 PM

Title: Re: Pointing Out through Appearances

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Mind-only refers only to the container universe, including bodies; it does not mean that other's minds are only your mind. Relatively speaking, i.e. false relative truth, there are still outer appearances, etc. True relative truth is that all these external appearances are just activated traces in the mind. Ultimate truth is that even mind is not established as truly existent and real.

Lazy_eye said:

Okay -- sorry to be thick-headed here -- how does this apply to daily interactions with others? Acquaintances, friends, relatives, significant others, etc? These are statements indicating how things are, but what do we do with this knowledge when we interact?

Malcolm wrote:

This knowledge is meant to cut attachment to appearances as being real. If we understand that all our appearances and so on are merely the activation of karmic traces in the mind and have no reality at all apart from being our common and personal mental projections, then it is assumed our clinging to these appearances will be lessened.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 11:22 PM

Title: Re: Merit -- how would you explain this?

Content:

pael said:

How do you create non-samsaric? Is it enough to say after good act 'I dedicate this merit for supreme enlightenment'? If not, how then?

Malcolm wrote:

Inexhaustible merit is created through understanding that three things do not exist: merit itself, object of dedication and the act of dedicating.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 11:20 PM

Title: Re: having a drink

Content:

boda said:

Unfortunate for people like Chögyam Trungpa that this transmutation didn't turn the toxin into something that wasn't addictive, and didn't destroy the liver.

Malcolm wrote:

As far as Trungpa and drinking goes, people usually fail to observe the obvious — Trungpa was in intense pain all of the time from his accident. Alcohol was the only pain

killer that left him clear minded. He accomplished what he needed to, then he died.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 10:57 PM

Title: Re: Merit -- how would you explain this?

Content:

prsvrnc said:

If someone has merit, would that entail that they have a certain amount of "leverage" in the world...? They would be able to orchestrate situations more harmoniously and get goals met because of their merit? Would you say that is true?

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

prsvrnc said:

And maybe we could say this is true because they are more in touch with actual reality? They are in the path of the good, so to speak, in tune with how things really happen?

Malcolm wrote:

No. For example, in order to destroy the world, kill millions of Jews and so on, Hitler had to have had great merit to rise to such power; the same can be said of Stalin and Mao. But of course, since they were on a completely wrong path, they exhausted any such merit by turning that to evil purposes. So having great merit from past lives is not guarantee of being in touch with reality.

In order to be Indra, or to be reborn in the deva realm in general, you have to have even more merit than a million Hitlers, Stalins and Maos. But this merit too will be exhausted unless you meet the Dharma and practice it properly. An emperor in this life will be a beggar in the next. Merit is not necessarily nirvanic. There is also samsaric merit. Keep this in mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 10:15 PM

Title: Re: Pointing Out through Appearances

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

I'm wondering how this works on an interpersonal level. I mean, yes, ultimately it's all concepts and fabrications, but practically speaking there are other people and it seems important to interact on a human level. How do we cultivate the "mind-only" perspective while not losing sight of other people's needs, concerns, presence and humanity?

Malcolm wrote:

Mind-only refers only to the container universe, including bodies; it does not mean that other's minds are only your mind. Relatively speaking, i.e. false relative truth, there are

still outer appearances, etc. True relative truth is that all these external appearances are just activated traces in the mind. Ultimate truth is that even mind is not established as truly existent and real.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 10:13 PM

Title: Re: Pointing Out through Appearances

Content:

Wayfarer said:

I can see how it applies to many of the things that people assume are real, or to things that we attribute importance to. I get that, but I can't see how it applies to the raw truth of experience as such.

Malcolm wrote:

The raw experience i.e. the appearances of your senses, including the appearance of your body and its pleasures and pains, is just the activation of traces.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 10:08 PM

Title: Re: having a drink

Content:

Ayu said:

I don't have any certain members in my mind, but generally speaking:
Often I wonder, if speech would have been used less aggressively, if the members would refrain from touching their keyboard after their second drink.

Malcolm wrote:

I suspect that it is more like their second cup of coffee...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 10:07 PM

Title: Re: having a drink

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Dharma is not about following rules blindly.

Tenso said:

It's also not about making up your own rules either. I've personally benefited greatly from following the precept against intoxicants.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't follow any path based on rules. That said, if you find that following the precept

against drinking is good for you, then by all means continue.

boda said:

It's about following a path. A path that doesn't include intoxicants, for good reason.

Malcolm wrote:

Your path may exclude drinking wine with dinner. Or having a drink with friends. Mine doesn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 10:01 PM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

maybay said:

Just on the perception of Westerners by Tibetans and why they harp on about morality: If we appear shameless to Tibetans, then they assume we must lack morals. What good are precepts if you feel no shame in breaking them and you're too obdurate to feel remorse? How could someone tell if you were moral? Isn't that important?

Malcolm wrote:

Morality does not lie in keeping precepts — this is the point, actually, of Mahāyāna ethics.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 11:56 AM

Title: Re: Disappointed with this site

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No one here cannot knock you down, silence you, intimidate you or gang up on you.

dharmagoat said:

Maybe not in reality, but it can feel that way.

Seven years ago when I joined ESangha I was very sensitive to this. I would actually feel sick with fear when checking replies if I felt that I might be criticised by someone more competent than myself. If Namdrol had confronted me then (he never did), I would have ducked and run.

Malcolm wrote:

Namdrol never participated much in the beginners forums. Malcolm doesn't either.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 11:52 AM

Title: Re: having a drink

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Not for some people.

Tenso said:

Buddha strictly forbade it. You should know this.

Malcolm wrote:

The Dharma is not about following rules blindly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 11:05 AM

Title: Re: Disappointed with this site

Content:

Dan74 said:

Purpose is the key word that was mentioned above. What is the purpose of most exchanges here?

boda said:

The question asked above was basically: what is the purpose of bullying?

I think Malcolm answered that pretty well above:

Malcolm wrote:

... if you can't take the heat, well, go try and find a Dharma kindergarten somewhere.

boda said:

Talk about elitism, condescension, and harshness... the purpose is to drive away the dissonate voices.

Malcolm wrote:

There is no bullying here. That is in your imagination. No one here cannot knock you down, silence you, intimidate you or gang up on you. All they can do merely share their point of view. You can either agree or disagree. If you can't take disagreement, that says something about you, not the person who is disagreeing with you.

[sarcasm on] Maybe we should have trigger warnings on posts, just so people can avoid posts that might hurt their feelings. [/sarcasm off]

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 10:57 AM

Title: Re: having a drink

Content:
Tenso said:
Best to take the Buddha's advice and avoid it all costs.

Herbie said:
or take the middle way

Tenso said:
There's no middle way with alcohol unfortunately.

Malcolm wrote:
Not for some people.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 7:10 AM
Title: Re: Disappointed with this site
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
Basically, it is very simple. There are people here who are knowledgeable, and there are people here who are not. If you [not you specifically] wish to improve your own knowledge and understanding, then it is useful to put aside your projections about other people's personalities [whom you do not in fact know] and listen to what they have to say. If you are unable to do this because of your own ego problems, well, then it is likely you will continue to have unsatisfactory interactions with people here and in other web forums.

boda said:
Great advice, but this takes us back to where we started. Be respectful and learn from the 'masters', but if you bring any of your own ideas...

Malcolm wrote:
If someone wishes to prosecute their own ideas about Dharma in a place like this, it is no different than any other Dharma forum in history — your ideas will be challenged if they are unusual, and if you can't take the heat, well, go try and find a Dharma kindergarten somewhere. At least here you won't be executed for losing a debate.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 6:58 AM
Title: Re: having a drink
Content:

tomschwarz said:
his holiness the dalai lama often talks about happiness, that all beings have a right to be happy and how to attain happiness.

he often addresses the subject of drinking alcohol. he says that it may give you some

happiness, for example alliviate some aspect of anger. but then the next morning you still feel bad or worse.

has anyone had contradictory experience? have you experienced stable and long lasting improvements to your feeling of happiness drinking acoholic beverages?

Malcolm wrote:

He is talking about getting drunk, not having a glass or two of wine with dinner.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 6:53 AM

Title: Re: Disappointed with this site

Content:

boda said:

So the bullyboys have been to Potala? If that's the case then perhaps Potala is somewhat overrated.

Malcolm wrote:

It really depends if you are interested in going to the Potala, or just having a unrestricted free for all of ideas. If the latter is your aim, it is understandable that you might interpret so called "bullyboys" [and girls] in a negative light.

boda said:

Let me put it this way, if people who live in Potala appears to be wise I would want to go there. If people who live in Potala are asshats then I see no point in going there. There are more than enough asshats where I live.

Malcolm wrote:

Basically, it is very simple. There are people here who are knowledgable, and there are people here who are not. If you [not you specifically] wish to improve your own knowledge and understanding, then it is useful to put aside your projections about other people's personalities [whom you do not in fact know] and listen to what they have to say. If you are unable to do this because of your own ego problems, well, then it is likely you will continue to have unsatisfactory interactions with people here and in other web forums.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 6:38 AM

Title: Re: Disappointed with this site

Content:

boda said:

So the bullyboys have been to Potala? If that's the case then perhaps Potala is somewhat overrated.

Malcolm wrote:

It really depends if you are interested in going to the Potala, or just having a unrestricted free for all of ideas. If the latter is your aim, it is understandable that you might interpret so called "bullyboys" [and girls] in a negative light.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 6:13 AM

Title: Re: Disappointed with this site

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Generally, before making innovations in a given discipline, it is expected that one has learned the discipline. This seems to be true everywhere but in politics and religion.

boda said:

"In the beginner's mind there are many possibilities, but in the expert's there are few"
— Shunryu Suzuki

You probably saw that coming. But anyway, politics and religion are the most resistant to innovation. I imagine that has something to do with maintaining the status quo.

Malcolm wrote:

In general, there are those who talk about going to Potala, what it might be like, how big it is, and so on, but they really have no idea what the Potala is like. Then there are those who go there.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 5:55 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

At least in a liberal democracy, leaders are explicitly accountable to the people, installed by the people and rule only at the whim of the people, for better or worse.

maybay said:

You are like a doctor looking to administer the best medicine for the present suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, I am after all, a doctor.

maybay said:

Buddha as physician. Its all well and good. But I want to discuss the issues. Buddha as teacher. You want to reduce the options, I want to explore them. You put things in their

place, I kick things around.

Malcolm wrote:

Buddha did not discuss issues, he recommended cures. So, I don't think that Buddha was the kind of teacher you seem to modeling yourself on. Plato maybe, but not Buddha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 5:41 AM

Title: Re: Disappointed with this site

Content:

DGA said:

Generally, when someone comes to the board and says "Hi I'm new, I'm here to learn, here's what's going on..." and engages in conversation in a courteous way and in good faith, then that person has a good experience.

boda said:

But if you bring any of your own ideas...

Malcolm wrote:

Generally, before making innovations in a given discipline, it is expected that one has learned the discipline. This seems to be true everywhere but in politics and religion.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 5:33 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

maybay said:

It depends on the context. Hereditary systems are very conservative and everyone involved is honour bound and primed intensively for their role. I'm not against them.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read Āryadeva. He points out completely the fallacy of relying upon hereditary monarchs. Hereditary systems are extremely corruptible.

maybay said:

What do you mean by relying on? Anything constructed is corruptible. It just depends on the context.

Malcolm wrote:

You prove your moral strength by meeting obligations and discharging your responsibilities without being reckless with your increasing freedoms and benefits. It takes moral strength to avoid the temptations of power.

Then by this standard, virtually all kings fail.

maybay said:

What do you mean by fail? Kings are crazy. They live on a knife edge, and all the layers of people around them create a body of vested interests that relies on, among other things, the honour of the king and his court. If he is not able to preside with dignity over his kingdom, there will be rivals. There are rivals anyway, at home and abroad.

Malcolm wrote:

You have it exactly backwards my friend, kings are completely dependent upon the subjects for their power. If they are successful they manage to spin the illusion that power resides in them, but the reality is otherwise. This is why Āryadeva states that there are no fools greater than kings.

At least in a liberal democracy, leaders are explicitly accountable to the people, installed by the people and rule only at the whim of the people, for better or worse.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 5:19 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

Paul said:

And whose morals?

maybay said:

I guess it depends on the system. The incumbent authority, the electorate.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, with this guy it is all top down, it does not matter who is in power, just that they are in power.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 5:17 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

maybay said:

People shouldn't rise to positions of authority without proving their moral strength.

Malcolm wrote:

So I take it you are against hereditary systems then, kingships and the like?

And just how do you "prove" your "moral strength?"

maybay said:

It depends on the context. Hereditary systems are very conservative and everyone involved is honour bound and primed intensively for their role. I'm not against them.

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read Āryadeva. He points out completely the fallacy of relying upon hereditary monarchs. Hereditary systems are extremely corruptible.

maybay said:

You prove your moral strength by meeting obligations and discharging your responsibilities without being reckless with your increasing freedoms and benefits. It takes moral strength to avoid the temptations of power.

Malcolm wrote:

Then by this standard, virtually all kings fail.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 4:57 AM

Title: Re: Disappointed with this site

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

I just deal with the words on the page in front of me. I don't make judgments about the person writing them — by and large I don't know any of you.

dzogchungpa said:

Oh please.

Malcolm wrote:

Well, I am happy to make judgements about you if you like, but it isn't necessary for me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 4:34 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

maybay said:

People shouldn't rise to positions of authority without proving their moral strength.

Malcolm wrote:

So I take it you are against hereditary systems then, kingships and the like?

And just how do you "prove" your "moral strength?"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 4:31 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He meant that the Dharma should have made Tibet a better place and Tibetans better

people — but it didn't.

dharmagoat said:

In your estimation has the Dharma done better in China and Japan?

Malcolm wrote:

No, I am merely addressing the idea that Mahāyāna was best preserved in Tibet — other people just may not see it that way.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 2:47 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

He meant that the Dharma should have made Tibet a better place and Tibetans better people — but it didn't.

dharmagoat said:

Yet it would appear that Mahāyāna has been preserved in Tibet better than anywhere else.

Malcolm wrote:

I think Chinese Buddhists and Japanese Buddhists would not endorse this assessment at all.

Anyway, by whom was Mahāyāna preserved in Tibet? By an elite.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 2:35 AM

Title: Re: Disappointed with this site

Content:

DGA said:

Generally, when someone comes to the board and says "Hi I'm new, I'm here to learn, here's what's going on..." and engages in conversation in a courteous way and in good faith, then that person has a good experience. At least, that person is unlikely to have his or her issues reflected back.

There have been instances of bullying and piling on at DW, and I don't want to dismiss those or minimize them. I do want to point out that not everyone reacts well when their pretensions are pointed out to them. Dunning-Kruger effect.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dunning%E2%80%93Kruger_effect

dharmagoat said:

It seems we decide whether certain posters are inherently pretentious, deluded, naive or innocent and treat them accordingly, with more kindness shown to the latter.

I agree that pretensions ought to be pointed out, but it is too easy to do this unkindly. In our culture the sentiment behind the expression "teach someone a lesson" is essentially unkind.

Malcolm wrote:

I just deal with the words on the page in front of me. I don't make judgments about the person writing them — by and large I don't know any of you.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 2:34 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dezhung Tulku opined that the Dharma failed in Tibet.

tomamundsen said:

Well, obviously it wasn't a complete failure. So, what exactly does he mean by the Dharma "failing"?

maybay said:

He means its our turn.

Malcolm wrote:

He meant that the Dharma should have made Tibet a better place and Tibetans better people — but it didn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 2:25 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

maybay said:

Its not about needs, or even the individual who takes the vow.

Malcolm wrote:

The point I am responding to is the chauvinistic narrative that permeates a lot of conversations among Western Buddhists [like you] about how Westerners are somehow ethically and morally stunted. It simply isn't true.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 1:16 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

Wayfarer said:

You do sometimes see 'dharma' translated as 'law' and is also sometimes equated with 'duty'. Karma likewise has sometimes been referred to as a law. Are these mis-translations?

Malcolm wrote:

There are ten definitions of the term "dharma."

The basic term, *dhr*, means "to bear."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 13th, 2015 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

Harimoo said:

It is interesting to read books about pre-invasion Tibet, like wayfarers describing their journey.

A part of Alexandra David-Neil's book where she depicted the life of the "slaves" in Tibet was censured in the second edition. I'm reading a book written by a kashmiri merchant who was astonished by the prescribed tortures for the robbers (lost head nails in the fingers).

The difference between then and now (in the East and the West), it's "religious" practise, which became "religiosity".

Malcolm wrote:

It is important to understand that in old Tibet there were no real laws per se that governed the behavior of people outside of Lhasa. There were very few courts, and aristocrats had a very free hand to dispense punishments pretty much as they saw fit. Those punishments were often cruel by modern standards, but certainly not by seventeenth and eighteenth century standards. Tibet was largely governed by custom and local councils.

Banditry was a family business in much of Eastern Tibet, right up through the 1950's. Paltrul Rinpoche's brother in fact was one of the most famous bandits in Tibetan history.

Tibet was not a Shangri-lha, but it was also not the medieval hell some leftist writers have tried to make out. It was like anywhere else humans have lived. People like to think that because the Tibetans preserved the Dharma it is a "nicer" place — but I think they would be in for a rude surprise. We mainly know Tibet from the point of view of an educated elite. We have very little knowledge of the subaltern Tibet, the Tibet of illiterate farmers, wives, merchants, hunters, soldiers, prostitutes, criminals and bandits. The fact that our main window into old Tibet is through the window of the elite skews our view quite a bit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 12th, 2015 at 11:58 PM

Title: Re: the idea of historicity and spiritual practice

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

are the Sravakayana and Mahayana vehicles are actually headed to the same destination?

Astus said:

Yes. I think it is best illustrated by the five aggregates. They are already impermanent, dependently originated and without self. The difference between delusion and enlightenment regarding that is what results in either attachment and dissatisfaction or freedom and peace. So there are the "five aggregates with attachment" for the deluded, and the "five aggregates" (as they are) for the enlightened. This is true in every Buddhist system I'm aware of.

Nirvana according to...

This is where things can become difficult, as texts and people can use all sorts of poetic language to talk about nirvana for various reasons. To keep it simple, it's just as in the four noble truths: the end of the cause of suffering.

Malcolm wrote:

Liberation is the exhaustion of error.

— Maitreyanatha.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 12th, 2015 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: the idea of historicity and spiritual practice

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

This is precisely the annihilationist nirvana of which Mahāyana is so critical.

Lazy_eye said:

But Sujato and Thanissaro would say they are accurately presenting what is found in the nikayas. So what are the options? I can think of three:

-- Go with Mahayana sources

-- Try to show their view is wrong/debatable even from a "nikayan" or "sravakayana" perspective

-- Attempt to use historicity to settle the argument

Malcolm wrote:

We can assume they are not stream entrants, not speaking from personal experience.

So why would we actually credit what they say? I think Peter Harvey would disagree with them. See his *Selfless Mind: Personality, Consciousness and Nirvāṇa in Early Buddhism*.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 12th, 2015 at 9:50 PM

Title: Re: the idea of historicity and spiritual practice

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

Nibbana according to Thanissaro and Sujato:

Thanissaro said:

Nibbana itself is not the same thing as the awakened mind. The fact that you have a mind that's still functioning in the world after awakening that is part of the fuel remaining when you have nibbana with fuel remaining and nibbana with no fuel remaining. When you hit the point with nibbana with no fuel remaining there is no activity at all.

<http://dhammawheel.com/viewtopic.php?f=13&t=20626&p=357794&hilit=nibbana+thanissaro#p357776>

Sujato said:

...the Buddha's real teaching is not to temporarily escape materiality, but to reach an ending of suffering. And since all forms of *viññāṇa* (*yaṃ kiñci viññāṇaṃ...*) are said countless times to be suffering, even the infinite consciousness has to go.

<https://sujato.wordpress.com/2011/05/13/vinna%E1%B9%87a-is-not-nibbana-really-it-just-isn%E2%80%99t/>

Lazy_eye said:

Not to mention the [http://www.audiodharma.org/series/5/talk/1847/...](http://www.audiodharma.org/series/5/talk/1847/)

Malcolm wrote:

This is precisely the annihilationist nirvana of which Mahāyana is so critical.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 12th, 2015 at 12:32 PM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

Adamantine said:

Dezhung Tulku opined that the Dharma failed in Tibet.

And one Sakya tulku's opinion is supposed to be gospel?

Malcolm wrote:

I tend to trust the opinions of those who have personal experience over the opinions of people of those who don't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 12th, 2015 at 11:25 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

It was more streamlined, i.e., men pretty much raped whoever they wanted. Rape has been a huge cultural problem in Tibet for millenia. This is nothing new. Nuns in particular were targets for rape. Deal with it.

.

Adamantine said:

It's a huge cultural problem here, now.

Malcolm wrote:

Have you seen the rape stats for Tibetan women? It is not better.

Adamantine said:

It is clear that the five poisons have been present throughout the history of humankind, sure, this is samsara. However it appears that at times when the dharma has taken deep root in a culture it has had a pacifying effect to a degree.

Malcolm wrote:

Dude, what fantasy planet are you living on?

Adamantine said:

I certainly don't think of old Tibet as a shangri-la, that's your own projection but not at all my view. However for a few centuries it was likely a much more supportive environment to study and practice the dharma in.

Malcolm wrote:

Dezhung Tulku opined that the Dharma failed in Tibet.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 12th, 2015 at 11:09 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahahaha...you think casual adultery was not rampant among pre-modern Tibetans? .

Adamantine said:

I don't think it was this streamlined: <https://www.ashleymadison.com>

Malcolm wrote:

It was more streamlined, i.e., men pretty much raped whoever they wanted. Rape has been a huge cultural problem in Tibet for millenia. This is nothing new. Nuns in particular were targets for rape. Deal with it.

Tibetan aristocrats did whatever they wanted to poor people with no remedy. This is a

fact. I have had long conversations about this with Tibetan Lamas raised in Tibet. Tibet was just a human land and the things aristocrats would do to poor people were nothing short of unbelievably barbaric as well as widespread and systematic.

You do understand that Tibetans hunted a lot? Right? Where do you think they got all those furs they loved to wear?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 12th, 2015 at 11:07 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahahaha...you think casual adultery was not rampant among pre-modern Tibetans? How about lying, gossip, harsh speech and calumny? You think our modern cultural conditioning makes these nonvirtues worse? This is utterly foolish thinking.

Have you ever seen how Tibetans treat their dogs? I have and it is nothing praiseworthy.

Adamantine said:

I'd agree those things were probably happening fairly often but I think the value of lives of even small creatures was more ingrained in their conditioning than in ours.

Malcolm wrote:

My friend, you are living in a fantasy.

Adamantine said:

And the potentials for idle chatter, gossip, harsh speech etc. are infinitely multiplied now with the glorious tech assistance of smart phones and social media sites. There are entire new trends of cyber-bullying, flame wars, twitter wars etc. Nowadays, at least in urban centers people are scarcely finding a few minutes without some kind of chattering. I don't think this was the case in old Tibet, or old India, or old anywhere. But it's our cultural context that developed these smart devices, programs and apps.

Malcolm wrote:

You really need to study Tibetan history. You are succumbing to a sort of nostalgic "it was so much better in the good old days."

Humans beings have never lacked for opportunity to be mean spirited and nonvirtuous. The idea that we Humans are worse now than we were before is really just a total fantasy. The truth is that we are the same, we have not gotten worse, and we have not gotten better. It is absolutely absurd to suppose that Tibet was this Shangri-la where everyone was more virtuous. It really isn't true. If it is were true, then how can we explain

all the hyper-critical remarks we find great Dharma practitioners making about Tibetans from the earliest period of the presence of Dharma in Tibet — was it all sour grapes?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 12th, 2015 at 10:59 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

maybay said:

About your argument, rights culture is really about the resurgence of the political classes over the religious, jurists over priests, the laws of men over the law of God.

Malcolm wrote:

There are no laws of God. Never have been.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 12th, 2015 at 10:45 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Apparently Buddha thought we were all pretty pathetic.

Nevermind. I know Buddha didn't invent Vinaya as a Buddhist Moral Code.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps you have to remind Khampa lay people not to kill each other; but in America, most people who come to Dharma are already inclined not to kill each other.

Adamantine said:

Hmmmnn.. most Westerners, including a fair share of those who might identify with Buddhism, don't even think twice when they smash an annoying bug or lay poison out for pests. . . the vow of not killing and intentionally preserving lives is not only intended for human lives, as you know.

No need to mention idle chatter, gossip and lying. . .

sexual orifice extravaganzas, casual adultery. . I don't think our modern cultural conditioning is remotely in line with the 10 basic ethical conducts so it is somewhat against our habitual tendencies to follow them, and many people will try to change Buddhism, or outright reject it before they change their habits, sadly.. and this has already happened plenty enough times.

Malcolm wrote:

Hahahahaha...you think casual adultery was not rampant among pre-modern Tibetans? How about lying, gossip, harsh speech and calumny? How about rape and stealing?

You think our modern cultural conditioning makes these nonvirtues worse? This is utterly foolish thinking.

Have you ever seen how Tibetans treat their dogs? I have and it is nothing praiseworthy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 12th, 2015 at 5:27 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

Paul said:

Can I come along? I can bring chocolate biscuits and a Krishna Das CD...

dzogchungpa said:

You're in.

Malcolm wrote:

How about Suns of Arqa and little Bonobo?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 12th, 2015 at 4:02 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Apparently Buddha thought we were all pretty pathetic.

Nevermind. I know Buddha didn't invent Vinaya as a Buddhist Moral Code.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps you have to remind Khampa lay people not to kill each other; but in America, most people who come to Dharma are already inclined not to kill each other.

conebeckham said:

The main point regarding ethics this Lama stressed was, as Dzoki refers to, "discipline." The discipline to keep vows, yes, but also a more general sort of discipline--not to be confused with the inability to relax.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzoki's post was typical of western Buddhists beating up their brothers and sisters. It is sad really. Convert syndrome. Most so-called "Buddhists" are not "serious," whether they are Tibetan, American, European, Japanese, Chinese, etc. It's total bullshit to single out Westerners for some special criticism.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 12th, 2015 at 1:56 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

conebeckham said:

Great post, Dzoki, by the way....and if it matters, I will say that I had a very intimate conversation with a Lama who echoed the feeling regarding ethics lacking in Western Vajrayana culture, and feeling that the only complete and successful transplantation of Vajrayana to the West will occur when Ethical training becomes the foundation. Not necessarily "Monasticism," mind you.....

Malcolm wrote:

Listen, this is too heavy handed. The only ethics we need are to understand is that we should avoid ten things and do their opposite. All this Sturm and Drang around "the lack of ethics" among western Buddhists is a bunch of culturally biased nonsense. Tibetans and other Asians should examine themselves first, especially teachers, especially, lamas, especially Asian monks.

Honestly, whoever needs a vow to avoid these ten things is really pathetic.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 12th, 2015 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: Trouble at Tricycle Magazine

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

However, you can see in the instructions he gave to kings that he consistently advised against the kind of policies we today characterize as neo-liberal (expansionism, conquest, imperial ambitions) and advised liberal policies frequently. Moreover, we can see that Nāgārjuna gave similar advice (provide health care, maintain and upgrade infrastructure, eliminate capital punishment, etc.).

Queequeg said:

Indeed. However, Liberalism in the US anyway, has become closely aligned, if not synonymous with the heavy, ham handed force of bureaucratic government. Hence, I can't imagine Buddha agreeing with its MO, except as an expedient.

That said, I'm feeling the Bern.

Malcolm wrote:

When businesses are allowed to become huge, a large government is necessary to control them. This is the lesson of the late 19th century monopolies, and the beginning of the monolithic federal period in US history, which was actually initiated by Republicans like Theodore Roosevelt.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 12th, 2015 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

Queequeg said:

One of the problems in the West with the rise of Secularism is that the entire Rights framework is ungrounded when religion, and specifically, God, is removed from the equation. The idea of Rights comes from a variety of sources including in no small part, Natural Law which has been understood as God's Law.

Malcolm wrote:

You should read Nature's God: The Heretical Origins of the American Republic. It may cause you to revise your opinion.

...the most popular narrative concerning the very idea of America— one that unites Christian nationalists with a large number of sober historians— has it that the American Republic owes its independence and its individual freedoms to its Protestant Christian legacy. 86 This narrative often comes with a distinguished lineage that traces the ideas of individual rights and freedom of conscience to seminal Protestant thinkers such as John Milton (1608– 1674), and it characteristically represents Jefferson, Madison, and precursors like Locke as latitudinarian Protestants or (to use a label that at the time would have sounded like a gross oxymoron) “Christian Deists.” 87 But this gets the history of ideas almost exactly wrong. It is to confuse mere precedence in time with causality. It is to suppose, falsely, that the ideas that best explain the actions of a collective are those that a majority of people within it pretend to carry around in their heads. Reformed religion brought carnage to Britain and Germany in the seventeenth century and madness to America in the eighteenth because it was a symptom of modernity, not a cause— a pathology, not a theory.

Stewart, Matthew (2014-07-01). *Nature's God: The Heretical Origins of the American Republic* (pp. 72-73). W. W. Norton & Company. Kindle Edition.

And:

For the further clarification of the meaning of this “Religion of Nature’s God,” he referred his readers to “[Alexander] Pope’s little Essay on Man, confessedly deduced from the inspiration of Lord Bolingbroke, and perhaps every sentence adopted by me.” In some alternate universe— such as perhaps the one constructed from the nationalist myths that have long gripped American historiography— Young’s peculiar “Religion of Nature’s God” might have amounted to little more than a historical oddity. It was just the cloudy reflection of a disturbing individual who was always fishing in troubled waters. To judge from the hate that filled the newspapers of the time, it was a quite unpopular form of belief, deeply at odds with all the accepted varieties of the Christian religion. Yet the curious fact is that Young, like Allen, manifestly saw his unusual religion as an intimate component of the revolutionary political struggle in which he was engaged. The rights he claimed on behalf of his countrymen against the British Parliament and even against the Crown itself were not the rights guaranteed to Englishmen by their constitution, nor the rights due to Christians, but the rights deriving from the laws of nature and of

“Nature’s God.” And Young and Allen were far from alone in their revolutionary theology. Indeed, “Nature’s God” was the presiding deity of the American Revolution. Franklin invoked it in his newspaper articles as early as 1747.

Stewart, Matthew (2014-07-01). *Nature's God: The Heretical Origins of the American Republic* (p. 138). W. W. Norton & Company. Kindle Edition.

And:

In most versions of America’s revolutionary history, the term “deism,” if it appears at all, is taken to refer to a superficial theological doctrine about a “watchmaker God” who fashions a world of mechanical wonders and then walks away to the sound of ticking noises. Deism, according to this line of interpretation, was just a watery expression of the Christian religion, adulterated somewhat with the platitudes of the Enlightenment. It was the opposite of atheism, as the dictionary tells us, and it should count as thumpingly religious by modern standards. It arose in Britain around the turn of the eighteenth century and arrived in America in a moderate and conciliatory mood, quite different from the atheistic Enlightenment that took hold in France and elsewhere. The informed consensus today further supposes that deism was a detachable doctrine, present to some degree among the educated elites in revolutionary America, but only incidentally connected with the political ideology of its revolutionaries. All of this, I now think, is not quite right. “Deism” in its own day referred not to a superficial theological doctrine but to a comprehensive intellectual tradition that ranged freely across the terrain we now associate with ethics, political theory, metaphysics, the philosophy of mind, and epistemology. It was an astonishingly coherent and systematic body of thought, closer to a way of being than any particular dogma, and it retained its essential elements over a span of centuries, not decades. In origin and substance, deism was neither British nor Christian, as the conventional view supposes, but largely ancient, pagan, and continental, and it spread in America far beyond the educated elite.

Although America’s revolutionary deists lavished many sincere expressions of adoration upon their deity, deism is in fact functionally indistinguishable from what we would now call “pantheism”; and pantheism is really just a pretty word for atheism. While deism could often be associated with moderation in politics, it served principally to advance a system of thought that was revolutionary in its essence and effects. This essentially atheistic and revolutionary aspect of deism, I further contend, is central to any credible explanation of the revolutionary dimension of the American Revolution.

Stewart, Matthew (2014-07-01). *Nature's God: The Heretical Origins of the American Republic* (pp. 5-6). W. W. Norton & Company. Kindle Edition.

Declaration of Independence:

When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 12th, 2015 at 1:22 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

dzoki said:

So in the end the situation is such that there are people who have entered vajrayana and then left, there are people who have stayed on but have even become worse than they were before they received their first empowerment, there are people who stagnate and there are a very very few fortunate ones who have gotten it right from the beginning and who seriously practice the path.

Malcolm wrote:

You forgot the fifth kind of Westerner — the people who enter Buddhist teachings and instead of becoming more flexible, smooth and kind, use the Dharma to become more and more rigid, rough and intolerant of others, more insufferable and self-aggrandizing because they believe they are "doing it right" [complete with hair, clothes, and ritual gear] — building nice cages for themselves and very uncomfortable prisons for others.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 12th, 2015 at 1:11 AM

Title: Re: Can Westerners REALLY be Dharma practitioners?

Content:

amanitamusc said:

He definitely had extreme opinions of western practitioners and Bhudha Dharma in general.

His underwear was a bit tight?

He should have gotten out a bit more?

Karma Dorje said:

At least he could spell "Buddha". And "underwear".

Malcolm wrote:

He had editors — but really a spelling flame? That is so 1990's.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 12th, 2015 at 12:10 AM

Title: Re: Dealing with Christian Fundamentalists, Part 2

Content:

DGA said:

[This includes fundamentalist Christians, of course, but also Jews, Muslims, vegetarians, Subaru enthusiasts, Trekkies--anything, really.

Malcolm wrote:

And Republicans...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 11th, 2015 at 11:41 PM

Title: Re: the idea of historicity and spiritual practice

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

Again, I'm just wondering what is the intersection between these ideas of historicity, and how they actually inform one's view as a Dharma practitioner.

Malcolm wrote:

It is useful to use these concepts:

Myth: a traditional story, especially one concerning the early history of a people or explaining some natural or social phenomenon, and typically involving supernatural beings or events.

Legend: a traditional story sometimes popularly regarded as historical but unauthenticated

Fable: a short story, typically with animals as characters, conveying a moral.

Chronicle: a factual written account of important or historical events in the order of their occurrence.

History: the study of past events, particularly in human affairs:

For example, sūtras mostly fit the bill as legend. However, there are a number of texts in Hināyāna and Mahāyana that can only be described as myths. The tantras, for the most part are myths, but some, especially lower tantras, more in line with legends. Dzogchen tantras are entirely within the realm of myth.

The Jatakas are clearly fables in the modern sense of the term.

The premodern "histories" we encounter are more properly considered chronicles.

Prior to the 20th century, really, there was no Buddhist history. Buddhist history is an entirely modern thing. True, these other terms I am using are also modern categories, but I think they are useful ways of approaching the different kinds of texts in the Buddhist tradition. For example, as practitioners, we are mostly inspired by the myths, legends and chronicles which form context for our practice. We are not so much concerned [to greater and lesser extents] with history in the modern sense of the term.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 11th, 2015 at 11:03 PM

Title: Re: Dharma Decline

Content:

maybay said:

The question is whether ignorant sentient beings are better off when Dharma fails to be institutionalized.

dharmagoat said:

Well put.

Despite my dislike of institutions in general, I think all living beings are better off for having Buddhism so accessible.

YesheDronmar said:

I agree as well; without libraries and gompas and *places* to hold the precious teachings, I never would have met the dharma nor have had access to so much grace and blessings. There is a balance in all of this. And, some of us actually prefer to join into organizations instead of practicing alone. Some of us learn more quickly in groups. There are many different methods for the many types of sentient beings. Creating and maintaining institutions is one method, though not the only one.

Malcolm wrote:

Libraries are great. The problem is that in general access to them was and is restricted. Monasteries are great, but they are mostly engaged in worldly activity, not Dharma activity. There is no problem with a group of practitioners meeting, but it is good to be clear on the distinction between practice and socializing.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 11th, 2015 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Trouble at Tricycle Magazine

Content:

Queequeg said:

As for the Neoliberal MO being at odds with Buddhism, so is the Liberal MO. I don't think Buddha would have been a Democrat. Not a Republican, either.

Buddha would have given this whole thing the face-palm mudra.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, he would have been neither.

However, you can see in the instructions he gave to kings that he consistently advised against the kind of policies we today characterize as neo-liberal (expansionism, conquest, imperial ambitions) and advised liberal policies frequently. Moreover, we can

see that Nāgārjuna gave similar advice (provide health care, maintain and upgrade infrastructure, eliminate capital punishment, etc.).

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 11th, 2015 at 2:28 AM

Title: Re: Dharma Decline

Content:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 11th, 2015 at 1:36 AM

Title: Re: Dharma Decline

Content:

DGA said:

A free association is the forming of a group, political alliance, or other organization without any constraint or external restriction. There isn't a bureaucracy in the DC. Each gar has a rotating board, a person responsible for maintaining the grounds and buildings, and a secretary for handling official business. The DC has a center, but no hierarchy. ChNN is basically the first member of the DC.

That's well and good--but what you are describing are the protocols of a specific kind of bureaucracy that are active within a particular kind of social institution.

Malcolm wrote:

bureaucracy |byoṛ rākresē|

noun (pl. bureaucracies)

a system of government in which most of the important decisions are made by state officials rather than by elected representatives.

- a state or organization governed or managed as a bureaucracy.
- the officials in a bureaucracy, considered as a group or hierarchy.
- excessively complicated administrative procedure, seen as characteristic of bureaucracy: the unnecessary bureaucracy in local government.

This definition does not apply to the DC. The DC is an association, it is not a bureaucracy.

DGA said:

This isn't a criticism of the DC by any means. It's just an observation on the role of institutions as means for people to relate to each other. Institutions are simply the forms in which human relationships are structured and mediated.

Malcolm wrote:

Perhaps we need to recognize there is a spectrum between formal and informal institutions. My focus is primarily on the former.

DGA said:

Parenthetically: Weber's description of how a free association oriented around a charismatic leader inevitably coalesces into an institution with steadily increasing bureaucratic tendencies (unless it disintegrates) is among its most durable ideas.

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, this is when I leave the DC.

DGA said:

This is a little off the issue — my point in general was that Dharma exists in people, not institutions. Institutions are not persons. Dharma only exists person. The extent to which Dharma exists in its members, only to that extent can we say that Dharma lives in this or that institution.

I don't dispute your point that Dharma exists in people. I am merely pointing out that institutions are means by which people relate to each other.

Malcolm wrote:

The point I am making is that people put too much importance on the container, and not enough importance on the contents. A gold vase can contain shit. A clay vase can contain gold. Which vase will you pick?

DGA said:

Transmission of Dharma is about relationships, and relationships take specific forms. These forms may or may not be helpful at a given time, which is why your point about the mutability of these institutions is an important one.

Malcolm wrote:

The transmission of Dharma is a family thing. You have a teacher, and fellow students. The minute it becomes more than this, the minute the organization becomes the main point, at that moment, Dharma ceases being transmitted.

DGA said:

I just don't buy the anarcho-libertarian argument that institutions are inherently problematic, and the solution is simply to free individuals to do free individual stuff. Institutions just are. Their value or pathology depends on how they are used.

Malcolm wrote:

[/quote]

For Dharma, formal institutions have inherent problems because they are so easily corrupted.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Wednesday, November 11th, 2015 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Trouble at Tricycle Magazine

Content:

DGA said:

And they may be fighting over nothing in the end. I know that libraries buy Tricycle; does anyone else? Is their online presence profitable?

Malcolm wrote:

I don't think many people take Tricycle very seriously. Especially not after Tworkov went after Trungpa.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 10th, 2015 at 10:59 PM

Title: Re: Trouble at Tricycle Magazine

Content:

DGA said:

I don't know anything about Mr Shaheen. Was he on the Tricycle board when this went down?

<http://www.abuddhistlibrary.com/Buddhism/A%20-%20Tibetan%20Buddhism/Authors/Samuel%20Bercholz/Open%20Letter%20to%20Tricycle/Open%20Letter%20to%20Tricycle.htm>

Malcolm wrote:

Yes, he was.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 10th, 2015 at 10:48 PM

Title: Re: Dharma Decline

Content:

DGA said:

for the record, even a free association is an example of a social institution.

it's merely a social institution with a specific kind of bureaucracy. (anyone want to argue that a free association generally or the DC specifically lack bureaucracy?)

Malcolm wrote:

A free association is the forming of a group, political alliance, or other organization without any constraint or external restriction. There isn't a bureaucracy in the DC. Each gar has a rotating board, a person responsible for maintaining the grounds and buildings, and a secretary for handling official business. The DC has a center, but no hierarchy. ChNN is basically the first member of the DC.

This is a little off the issue — my point in general was that Dharma exists in people, not institutions. Institutions are not persons. Dharma only exists person. The extent to

which Dharma exists in its members, only to that extent can we say that Dharma lives in this or that institution.

The Buddha did not leave behind any institutions. He established no authority to take up his mantle upon his passing. He did create a discipline, but all the Buddhist institutions we have today arose after the Buddha and none were established by him. We should keep this in mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 10th, 2015 at 10:28 PM

Title: Re: Dharma Decline

Content:

Kunzang said:

Don't be silly. Of course it is. Even has a tulku ready to take the helm when the master passes.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the DC is a free association, with no hierarchy.

Karma_Yeshe said:

Of course it has a hierarchy. It has a president (currently Chögyal Namkhai Norbu), who has many special rights.

See page nr. 8 of the Statute of the International Dzogchen Community:

http://dzogchencommunity.org/assets/International-Dzogchen-Community-Statute_new-version_15102013_edarev-Registrato-notaio.pdf

Malcolm wrote:

This is just for show, in order to correspond with European laws of association.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 10th, 2015 at 10:22 PM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Those of us living in the West, i.e. the US, Australia, Canada Latin America, etc., should be aware that we are only here because of centuries of systematic ethnic cleansing and genocide of First Nations. We need to deal with this as a civilization and stop sweeping it under the rug. Until we openly confront the colonialist underpinnings of "Western Civilization" we will continue descend into barbarisms like the Iraq war and so on.

All talk of "the sacred" should be conducted with this in mind.

boda said:

Religion can help to mobilize a nation to take resources from "heathens" (nothing about them being sacred).

Malcolm wrote:

Precisely.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 10th, 2015 at 10:21 PM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

Reality is sacred. The translation of the Tibetan term for emptiness (lack of inherent existence) 'dön dam denpa' literally means 'holy object truth'. 'dam' is the word that equates to holy or sacred.

The Three Jewels are holy. Anything that permanently liberates ourselves from suffering is holy and it is a vital and important term that also signifies the importance of Buddhist faith.

Malcolm wrote:

No, don dam bden pa is a translation of paramārtha-satya. It means, literally, "truth of the ultimate goal."

Dam pa itself simple means superior or sublime, it's synonym is 'phags pa, and also yang dag pa, i.e. true, and mchog tu 'gyur ba, i.e. supreme.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 10th, 2015 at 12:45 PM

Title: Re: Dharma Decline

Content:

maybay said:

A concept of an afterlife and a concept of liberation are not necessary for the construction of a coherent, robust and comprehensive system of morals and ethics. If you are attached to this life, you are not a person of Dharma. Jetsun Drakpa Gyaltsen: First, for non-attachment to this life, you must put aside the non-Dharma person's manner of practicing moral conduct, hearing, contemplation, and meditation which are performed for the sake of this life.

Malcolm wrote:

Great advice for someone who want to follow Dharma but it is irrelevant to the statement to which you are objecting.

maybay said:

Today they simply act out norms without examination.

Malcolm wrote:

This a baseless judgement, an expression of opinion, not a fact.

maybay said:

One of the developments of political culture has been the separation of people from their office. The role is one thing, the person another.

Malcolm wrote:

People have always been separate from their office — there is never, ever been a divine king. Not one.

maybay said:

So before a king would exercise moral judgement as himself, now a president must act as a president acts, for the duration of his presidency.

Malcolm wrote:

Kings and presidents are no different. Each has a term, each has an office, neither is a power unto himself.

maybay said:

Of course people will always have moral agency, but the roles people must take in the institutions of secular society don't facilitate that agency or its development.

Malcolm wrote:

Oh, yes, as if Europe under Rome was a highpoint of moral fiber, etc. Religious domination of a culture does not ensure the facilitation of the moral agency of either its rulers nor its subjects. History demonstrates this again and again. In fact, arguably, Religions again and again corrupt people's moral agency by imbuing some people with imputed value based on a social hierarchy that is merely a product of economic arrangements.

maybay said:

In a corporatized, risk averse society, the whole question of morality is a liability. The liberal society's problem of competing religions is the problem of competing morals, which is why secular society is amoral.

Malcolm wrote:

In a religious society, moral agency is a liability since people who exercise their moral agency generally find themselves challenging religious authorities merely by their actions. Religious societies indeed generally strip people of their moral agency by insisting they behave according to catechism rather than conscience.

The so-called liberal society is the only means of finding a common ground in a pluralistic world and ensuring everyone is treated with fairness.

Asian cultures have more fear from corporatization, as their social history has

programmed Asians into sublimating their egos into the group.

One of the great legacies of the First Nations in North America to European settlers who eventually exterminated them by and large, is our American sense of individualism and personal freedom— because that certainly did not come from the European experience.

Modern corporatization is just an extension of European Colonialism. There will always be dissenters from it here in the US. But not in Asia, it fits in with the Asian mentality too well.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 10th, 2015 at 12:13 PM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

smcj said:

The Tibetan lamas I know do not have an issue with the word "sacred". In no small part that is because for them Christianity is a non-issue.

For us Christianity is a major issue, and anything that reminds us of it--even peripherally--is completely unacceptable. That prejudice is just as toxic to the transition of the Dharma to the West as inappropriate importation of western ideas imho.

Malcolm wrote:

The Chinese understood quite well the need to exclude Taoist terminology from Buddhist texts. We should follow suit.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 10th, 2015 at 10:52 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

smcj said:

With or without an equivalent word in their language, the idea that Tibetans do not consider Dharma to be "sacred" is preposterous from what I've seen and heard.

Malcolm wrote:

It is not preposterous when you understand that the word "sacred" does not really map well to Tibetan or even Buddhist ideas about things.

We constantly impute/inflict our own linguistic assumptions on cultures outside our own. As much as I am pretty conversant in Tibetan language and sciences such as medicine, astrological calculation and so on, culturally speaking I am an outsider looking into Tibetan culture [as distinct from Dharma] through the window of their language and texts. As an outsider, it is important that I am aware of my own penchant

to impute/inflict concepts and so on onto Tibetans they just don't share with Anglo-American culture.

This is one of the reasons I am so opposed to using language in translations that is saturated with native meaning for English speakers that does not reflect implications of a given term in the source language — in this case Tibetan. I gave an example, i.e. translating the Tibetan term *gzhi*, basis, as "ground of being", a theological term largely coined by the Catholic Theologian, Paul Tillich that has no meaning nor corollary in Buddhist discourse.

All the terms we might wish to gloss as "sacred" generally mean high, supreme, sublime, glorious, and so on, much more than they match our concept of "sacred" or "holy".

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 10th, 2015 at 7:34 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

Wayfarer said:

The passage where the Buddha declares that he has 'seen the house-builder' and will be 're-born no more' has no secular equivalent, as there is no way in secular thinking to accommodate that.

boda said:

I was wondering, how does anyone accommodate that? How do you accommodate it?

Wayfarer said:

When I say 'accommodate', what I mean is that a secular-scientific worldview doesn't have any categories in terms of which such a statement can be understood or explained. From the scientific-secular point of view, it is off the map, it is radically different to anything that can be accounted for in terms of the physical sciences or evolutionary biology.

In liberalism, there is an inbuilt 'respect for freedom of conscience' - that is basic to liberalism, and it's a good thing. However one of the consequences is that such ideas are accommodated as 'individual or social beliefs'. So *Nirvāṇa* is no longer a or the fundamental reality of existence - it's 'a belief'. People or groups are allowed to have such beliefs, but they're essentially either private, or socially-mediated, because they can't be accounted for in scientific terms. Hence that tends towards relativism, the idea that ultimately it is just a matter of belief, or to all intents, an opinion, and doesn't concern anything real.

Now maybe where that is changing is in the various attempts at cross-cultural dialogue, and there's some good things happening there. So it's not all doom and gloom. But for us living in the west, we need to be very aware of the background, lurking normativity of the 'scientific secular' worldview, as the 'arbiter of what is real'.

Malcolm wrote:

Those of us living in the West, i.e. the US, Australia, Canada Latin America, etc., should be aware that we are only here because of centuries of systematic ethnic cleansing and genocide of First Nations. We need to deal with this as a civilization and stop sweeping it under the rug. Until we openly confront the colonialist underpinnings of "Western Civilization" we will continue descend into barbarisms like the Iraq war and so on.

All talk of "the sacred" should be conducted with this in mind.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 10th, 2015 at 7:28 AM

Title: Re: Dharma Decline

Content:

maybay said:

Many people live, in the words of philosophers, an unexamined life.

Malcolm wrote:

Following a religion is no guarantee of living an examined life, indeed, it can utterly prevent it by providing a rote catechism.

maybay said:

Many people live, in the words of the Buddha, as if dead.

Malcolm wrote:

Religious belief does not mean you are exempt from Buddha's critique.

maybay said:

So lacking in mindfulness, so full of conceit, they consider themselves sovereign individuals first, and later, by choice, part of a tribe.

Malcolm wrote:

This is your imputation of a "moral" principle. Having the feeling that you belong to a tribe is just an extension of one's egotism. It does not make your egotism better.

maybay said:

A Hobbesian fallacy. You should know community is natural to humans. But a religious person sees not his tribe first, but a higher group which he chooses to recognize, e.g. "kingdom of God" or "all sentient beings".

Malcolm wrote:

Oh what rubbish. Many religious people do not recognize people of other religion as human. Honestly, you are deluding yourself with eloquent fantasies. The notion that religious people necessarily see the kingdom of god or all sentient beings above and beyond their affiliation is deluded.

maybay said:

Those people you know, they think they aren't religious, but they still embody so many sentiments and cultural artefacts of centuries of religious thought.

Malcolm wrote:

They are not religious people at all. They have none of the beliefs you claim are a necessary precondition for moral action.

maybay said:

There are parts of the world where people don't put the welfare and benefit of strangers above their own. They think it's the wrong thing to do.

Malcolm wrote:

And many of those people are religious, indeed, most of them are.

maybay said:

You say people matter not institutions. But today more than ever we find ourselves in roles without moral agency, mediated by secular institutions. In removing human error, technology, algorithms, are replacing the very possibility of being a fallible human.

Malcolm wrote:

No one is ever without moral agency. And technology will never remove the fallibility of being human, indeed much technological development is precisely a result of human folly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 10th, 2015 at 6:33 AM

Title: Re: Dharma Decline

Content:

maybay said:

Yes, I accuse those religions of lacking coherent, robust moral systems.

Malcolm wrote:

Staggeringly wrong-headed.

maybay said:

Any system of thought that ignores realities outside this life reduces the possibilities for action in this life to nothing more than rational self interest. That is not what I consider morality.

Malcolm wrote:

This is false reasoning. Many people with no religious belief in an afterlife or liberation nevertheless put the welfare and benefit of others above their own continually simply because they feel it is the right thing to do and they have the ability to be a benefit to others. I know many such people.

maybay said:

The notion that religious thinking a priori results in moral and ethical action is ludicrous. It results in moral possibility. That's all I'm saying.

Malcolm wrote:

What you are saying is obviously wrong. Religion is not at all necessary for moral and ethical action. It is not at all necessary for "moral possibility."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 10th, 2015 at 5:45 AM

Title: Re: Dharma Decline

Content:

maybay said:

All religions illustrate two essential possibilities for the future, typically either heaven vs hell, or entrapment vs liberation, or a combination. The moral decisions one makes plays a causative role in determining that future. But secular culture either makes no claims to the future, or settles for oblivion. Therefore, for the non-religious, moral actions in this life can play no part in determining that future. The future you experience (or don't) is unrelated to the moral decisions you make. Morality becomes indeterminate. Amorality.

Malcolm wrote:

One, not all religions make this claim; for example, Judaism has no concept of an afterlife or liberation. Neither do Confucism or Taoism. Would you accuse these faiths of lacking a coherent, robust ethical systems? I think not. In fact, the Purva Mimasa too do not believe in rebirth or liberation.

Therefore, your premise is stillborn.

A concept of an afterlife and a concept of liberation are not necessary for the construction of a coherent, robust and comprehensive system of morals and ethics.

For the nonreligious, the pursuit of an ethical life becomes an end in itself. Quite frankly, given the colonization and globalization that has destroyed the environment of the world and has lead to impoverishment of billions for the benefit of a few million, the ethics of the religious have not proven to a boon to humanity. There is very little correlation between a person's supposed religiosity and their ethical behavior. In fact, religion is used time and again for perpetrating highly immoral and unethical actions. The notion that religious thinking a priori results in moral and ethical action is ludicrous.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 10th, 2015 at 5:27 AM

Title: Re: Dharma Decline

Content:

Kunzang said:

Don't be silly. Of course it is. Even has a tulku ready to take the helm when the master passes.

Malcolm wrote:

No, the DC is a free association, with no hierarchy.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 10th, 2015 at 3:54 AM

Title: Re: Dharma Decline

Content:

DGA said:

How is the Dharma transmitted in the absence of social institutions committed to the systematic practice and transmission of Dharma?

Malcolm wrote:

The amazing thing is that Dharma continues to be transmitted despite institutions. There is no Dharma in institutions, there is only Dharma in people, and frankly — most people in Buddhist institutions are not very interested in Dharma.

Kunzang said:

Dzogchen Community is an institution. Do you feel this way about your vajra sibs too?

Malcolm wrote:

No, it really isn't, not in the way most people think about Dharma institutions [no monks, no monasteries, etc.]. There are some buildings, it is true. Who knows what will happen to those.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 10th, 2015 at 3:33 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

Punya said:

So what does "lha" as in "lha chos" mean Malcolm? And is this a collective term in Tibetan that would refer to the "specialness" (for want of a better word) of stupas of stupas relics, temples etc or is there another word?

(Interesting topic Tingzin)

Malcolm wrote:

The original meaning of Lha in Tibetan is "royal." Originally Dharma was the "chos" of the Tibetan Kings [chos is derived from a root which means to "rectify, repair." Lha also

means "high." It also means a god. It has associations with high status.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 10th, 2015 at 2:37 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

With regard to your last comment, "sacred outlook" does not work for dag snang. You do not need to consecrate anything to have dag snang. Dag snang is self-arising. You cannot fabricate dag snang.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, maybe, but as you like to point out, language is diachronic. I don't see why you can't repurpose 'sacred' in order to refer to a kind of natural or self-arising sacredness/purity or whatever.

Malcolm wrote:

You can, I won't. I like to keep terms with other religious as well as philosophical connotations out of Dharma discourse as much as possible. Its one of the reasons I object to the term "ground of being" so vehemently as a translation of gzhi.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Tuesday, November 10th, 2015 at 1:54 AM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

DGA said:

I'm not so sure about the concept of the sacred simply because, at least as I've been taught, everything without exception and everyone has sacred qualities--and if everything is sacred, then nothing isn't sacred, and the concept has no real meaning anymore.

dzogchungpa said:

Well, maybe. I think there is definitely a sense in Buddhism that things like stupas, relics, temples, certain people and places, images of Buddhas etc. are "special" in some positive way.

FWIW, CTR used the word 'sacred' quite a lot, and in particular translated "dag snang" as "sacred outlook", see e.g. "The Tantric Path of Indestructible Wakefulness".

Malcolm wrote:

With regard to your last comment, "sacred outlook" does not work for dag snang. You do not need to consecrate anything to have dag snang. Dag snang is self-arising. You cannot fabricate dag snang.

Stupas, relics, temples, are sacred precisely because they are "set apart," nevertheless, there still is no Buddhist word of which I am aware that maps to "sacred".

OED:

sacred | 'sākrid|

adjective

connected with God (or the gods) or dedicated to a religious purpose and so deserving veneration: sacred rites | the site at Eleusis is sacred to Demeter.

- religious rather than secular: sacred music.
- (of writing or text) embodying the laws or doctrines of a religion: a sacred Hindu text.
- regarded with great respect and reverence by a particular religion, group, or individual: an animal sacred to Mexican culture.
- sacrosanct: to a police officer nothing is sacred.

The nearest Tibetan word that overlaps might be " lha " in some of its uses, like " lha chos ", for example.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 9th, 2015 at 10:51 PM

Title: Re: The Sacred in Buddhism [from Dharma Decline]

Content:

tingdzin said:

Split from "Dharma Decline" thread

<http://dharmawheel.net/viewtopic.php?f=47&t=21203>

Kim O'Hara said:

I wouldn't mind at all (well, hardly at all) except that in losing religion we are losing ethics and morality (admittedly imperfect ethics and morality) faster than we can replace them with a more rationally based version of them.

tingdzin said:

This is a very interesting point, I think. Some posters have recently, on other threads, expressed the opinion that ethics and morality can exist without religion, and it seems a case made be made for this proposition. I would say that Kim is right, however, to point out that an ethical code based on an incomplete understanding of reality is still better than no ethical code at all.

Malcolm wrote:

Most secular people are of the opinion that a) reality is not completely understood, and b) religions [including Buddhism] are based on a far less complete understanding of reality than the present level of scientific knowledge.

Despite the fact that United States was founded on the ethnic cleansing of entire nations from their lands, which all Americans need to learn about, an important concept enshrined in the US Constitution is the Establishment Clause, which mandates what is popularly termed "the separation of church and state."

Because this is such an important principle in modern civilization, we have no choice but to continue to forge and strengthen a liberal ethical consensus apart from our individual religious convictions.

tingdzin said:

To shift the focus, though, I myself am of the opinion that when religion is lost, humanity also loses a sense of the sacred.

Malcolm wrote:

I don't agree with this at all. Religions tend to make "the sacred" beyond the reach of common people, creating celestial hierarchies that do little more than mirror the social divisions of the peoples they pretend to serve.

tingdzin said:

What does "sacred" mean to you?

Malcolm wrote:

It is not really a Buddhist word — I can't think of a single Buddhist term in either Sanskrit or Tibetan that truly maps to this term in the way it is used in English.

We can go back its root, consecrate, which really means to set something apart. We also have the word "holy" which ultimately derives from the word *kailo — whole, uninjured, of good omen.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 9th, 2015 at 10:11 PM

Title: Re: Dharma Decline

Content:

DGA said:

How is the Dharma transmitted in the absence of social institutions committed to the systematic practice and transmission of Dharma?

Malcolm wrote:

The amazing thing is that Dharma continues to be transmitted despite institutions. There is no Dharma in institutions, there is only Dharma in people, and frankly — most people in Buddhist institutions are not very interested in Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 9th, 2015 at 6:15 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

Rita_Repulsa said:

Tsongkhapa, I think it's interesting that some here claim things like, "Buddhism isn't an evangelical religion" despite the fact that Buddhism is well known for being the first

evangelical religion in recorded history. The Buddha said:

Go forth for the good of the many, for the happiness of the many, out of compassion for the world, for the welfare, the good and the happiness of gods and men. Let no two of you go in the same direction. Teach the Dharma which is beautiful in the beginning, beautiful in the middle and beautiful at the end. Proclaim both the letter and the spirit of the holy life completely fulfilled and perfectly pure.

Malcolm wrote:

Of course the Buddha wanted the Dharma to spread, but he did not want people to be zealots, which is what "evangelical" means outside of its specifically Christian meaning.

This is why there were strict rules laid down in the beginning about who could teach, who could be taught, when and where there could be teaching, and so on.

Evangelists don't care about context and decorum in their zeal to spread "the good news" and create converts.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 9th, 2015 at 5:54 AM

Title: Re: Dharma Decline

Content:

Arjan Dirkse said:

The dharma is the dharma. It is not the corrupt institution of Buddhism.

dharmagoat said:

We see the dharma through the lens of institutional Buddhism.

Malcolm wrote:

You may, I don't.

dharmagoat said:

Buddhism defines 'the dharma'.

Malcolm wrote:

Not for me.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Monday, November 9th, 2015 at 1:17 AM

Title: Re: Mani Kabum

Content:

Tigersnest said:

Are there any here who are experts regarding the Mani Kabum? As it has been translated to English and is freely available I wonder if the practices therein are open for Buddhist practitioner to use? As I have heard usually Chenrezig practice is openly available to

practice...

Malcolm wrote:

The Mani Kabum is a collection of instructions on the three inner tantras. The empowerment for it is called "The King's tradition Avalokiteśvara."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Sunday, November 8th, 2015 at 9:28 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

Rita_Repulsa said:

Buddhism

Malcolm wrote:

You can keep Buddhism. I have no use for it at all. I prefer Dharma.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 7th, 2015 at 11:15 PM

Title: Re: altar blessing

Content:

Johnny Dangerous said:

How important is it, and why? What should be done with statues which cannot be filled?

Can someone bless their own altar when no other option exists?

I've read/heard so many things, curious on opinions out there.

Malcolm wrote:

You put a piece of paper in the statue with Om aḥ and huṃ written on it. You summon the wisdom beings into the statue, you recite the mantra of dependent origination. That is enough.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 7th, 2015 at 11:00 PM

Title: Re: Some Questions about DC

Content:

Tenso said:

Which text?

Malcolm wrote:

I am not precisely sure, this is according to ChNN.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 7th, 2015 at 7:42 AM

Title: Re: How can karma know, and how do for instance hell wardens

Content:

boda said:

The question isn't about distinctness or contents, it's about values (good and bad) and interactions (cause and effect).

Malcolm wrote:

I was responding to your objection, not his question.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 7th, 2015 at 5:49 AM

Title: Re: How can karma know, and how do for instance hell wardens

Content:

Seishin said:

We know good and bad because of the discriminating mind and we are the creators of our own karma. It is not outside ourselves, not governed by a supernatural being.

boda said:

How could it be only inside ourselves? Or do you believe that everything, including other minds, are only a projection of your mind? If I'm not mistaken that's called solipsism.

Malcolm wrote:

Yogacara argues there is no container universe in reality, but that nevertheless, mind streams are distinct and unique.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 7th, 2015 at 5:40 AM

Title: Re: Dharma Assembly Photos

Content:

Caodemarte said:

Beautiful photos with promises of more to come from the Washington Post.

https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-sight/wp/2015/11/05/stunning-photos-from-tibetan-buddhists-bliss-dharma-assembly/?hpid=hp_no-name_photo-story-d%3Ahomepage%2Fstory

Malcolm wrote:

This place was founded by one of my most important gurus, the late Khenpo Jigme Phuntsok:

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 7th, 2015 at 5:32 AM

Title: Re: How can karma know, and how do for instance hell wardens

Content:

Ervin said:

Also, where they come from and who created them? How did they form? Because it seems that they know!!! Are these beings who are tottering wrongdoers also creating a bad karma, if not? How come?

Paul said:

He'll guardians are not sentient beings - they are projections from the mind of the hell being in question. It is not possible, therefore, to be reborn as a hell guardian. That also explains how they 'know' about the being they are torturing.

I think it was Asanga who explained this, but I'm not certain and can't look it up right now.

Ervin said:

Thanks Paul,

Is there any chance that you could provide a name and an excerpt of the sutra that explains what you are writing about?

Thanks

Malcolm wrote:

Read Vasubandhu's Viṃśatikākārikā.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 7th, 2015 at 2:32 AM

Title: Re: Gradual Teaching

Content:

Queequeg said:

I see. Point out the primordial state?

Malcolm wrote:

As Alpha states, no one can point it out to you; however, one's self-recognition can be encountered only with the help of a master. This is accomplished because we have experiences, and a master knows how to work with a student so that based on their own experiences they can recognize their own state.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Saturday, November 7th, 2015 at 2:07 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:
Everybody needs Buddhism...

Malcolm wrote:
No, everyone does not need Buddhism. Some people need food more, others need safety from threat of violent death, etc.

The practice of Buddhadharma is only within the grasp of those who have leisure and endowment.

Fundamentalists are those who insist that only their own path is good and everyone else's is wrong. This is not Buddhadharma. Buddhadharma sees the good in all worldly paths, and encourages that. It never suggests to people who are following other paths that they need to change, etc. If someone is interested in Buddhadharma, great. But there is no need to evangelize the Dharma — it won't work anyway.

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 6th, 2015 at 10:35 PM
Title: Re: The Buddha's Jihad! :D
Content:

Author: Malcolm
Date: Friday, November 6th, 2015 at 10:28 PM
Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism
Content:

Malcolm wrote:
Your argument is very much like saying there is no point in giving people medicine if they won't take up Dharma as their personal religion. It is quite extreme. A physician does not require his patients to change their religion in order to give them medicine. Buddha didn't either. He also taught the so called vehicle of gods and humans which concerns mundane ethics in order to create worldly benefit.

Tsongkhapafan said:
No, it's not. The vehicle of gods and humans has as its foundation a belief in karma.

Malcolm wrote:
No, actually it does not. Again, refer to the Kalamas Sutta.

Tsongkhapafan said:
You have to give people methods for practising ethics, you can't just tell them to 'be good' because without a method for being a good person, you will try, fail and feel guilty. This is many religious practitioners' experience if they don't have a path. Secular ethics is not a path because, being devoid of religion, it's just telling people to be good. It

doesn't work. Ethics devoid of meditation doesn't work.

Malcolm wrote:

Secular ethics is not a path in the Buddhist sense, certainly.

Apparently you have never heard of Confucianism, a perfectly lovely example of secular ethics where ethical conduct is engaged in purely because it results in social harmony. It is however a means of ensuring social good and harmony, and those are themselves worthy ends in their own right.

Tsongkhapa said:

Sure, of course not all people have the propensity to practise Dharma, but many do, many more than at present have access to it and therefore it would seem to be a good idea to create the conditions for them to be able to do so.

Malcolm wrote:

I though you understood the principles of karma. In any case, your original claim that His Holiness does not stress Buddhism is really complete and total nonsense. But by the same token, he is a political liberal, and understands the need for forging consensus and tolerance across religious lines — that cannot happen if he is constantly encouraging people to abandon their traditions for a new one. He is not an evangelist, unlike the Popes. That is not his job, and that has never been the job of Buddhist leaders.

Tsongkhapa said:

Humanism talks about it which is great but doesn't give people the methods to develop anything - without a path, without methods, there's no chance of success.

Malcolm wrote:

One does not need a method to develop love and compassion other than recognizing suffering and having the desire to do something to alleviate it as much as possible. Quite honestly, I know a lot of religious people who don't do shit to help others, Buddhists included, who spend all their time arguing about religion and praying rather than getting off their asses and helping others. I know a lot of completely non-religious people who devote their lives to helping others, and frankly, I know more of the latter who are actively engaged in helping others than the former.

[quote]

Those people who already have highly developed love and compassion have so because they met a spiritual path in the past and were able to practise moral discipline and meditations to improve their love and compassion. If there is no method there is no practice and no success. Just telling people to be good doesn't work.[/quote]

From the point of view of the narrative we follow, this makes sense. But it does not make sense to people who have not drunk the Buddhist koolaid and there is no good reason on earth that we should try and force people to accept our views. Instead we should

encourage people, without reference to religion, to be good, ethical people as ends in themselves because this leads to a harmonious society.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 6th, 2015 at 9:44 PM

Title: Re: Gradual Teaching

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The preliminaries are for those who have not yet understood what the primordial state is. Tregchö and thogal are inseparable: sometimes however, tregchö is parsed as "sudden" and thögal as "gradual", but this too is in reality misleading.

Astus said:

So, there is a gradual path for those who have not yet attained understanding. And once there is understanding, one should still follow through tregcho and thogal practices, so again, it seems gradual.

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is not a "path" in the sense that one goes from here to there, as alpha pointed out to you. There is no path like "first train in śamatha, then train in vipaśyāna; first train on path of accumulation, then application, then seeing, etc., first do creation, then do completion," etc.

Tregchö and thogal are not "practices" in the sense that one is making effort to generate a result from some cause. Tregchö and thögal are how one continues in the confidence of liberation, or as CHNN parses it, how one continues in the state.

The long and short of it is that Dzogchen teachings did not fit in the mold of gradual and sudden dichotomy [which is a conversation is only tangentially relevant to Dzogchen due to the conflict in Tibet over Indian and Chinese approaches to Mahāyāna sūtra].

They also do not fit into the mold of ultimate and relative truths. They do not fit into the mold of paths and stages.

Sudden means direct access to the ultimate. If there are stages involved in the path, it is necessarily gradual. So, if Dzogchen were just recognising the primordial state, then it would be a sudden method. If preliminaries and follow up practices are also included, it is gradual.

"Ultimate and relative" have no meaning in Dzogchen. Dzogchen is not "a method of directly accessing the ultimate," if it were, it would be Chan. Because this is so, Dzogchen is not a "sudden" system. One does not need to have realized emptiness in order to have knowledge [rig pa] of their primordial state [thog ma'i gzhi, a.k.a. original basis]. There is no need to gather accumulations and so on.

To the extent that there are stages in Dzogchen, there is only one stage and everyone is already on it. The Rig pa rang shar tantra likens it to being on a lake. No matter where you go on a lake, you never leave the lake.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 6th, 2015 at 6:52 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

Tsongkhapafan said:

It's a commitment of the Refuge Vows to encourage people to go for refuge out of compassion.

Malcolm wrote:

No, it isn't.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 6th, 2015 at 6:47 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

You don't. Dharma [Lha chos] is about personal transformation, not social transformation.

Tsongkhapafan said:

Why are Buddhists interested in social transformation? All meaningful change comes from personal transformation so anyone who wants meaningful change should be promoting inner change, not politics.

Dharma is not an evangelical religion.

Bodhisattvas and Buddhas out of their great compassion want everyone to practise Dharma as this is the only real solution to human problems. Of course they will try to create conditions to give people opportunities to do this.

Malcolm wrote:

Your argument is very much like saying there is no point in giving people medicine if they won't take up Dharma as their personal religion. It is quite extreme. A physician does not require his patients to change their religion in order to give them medicine. Buddha didn't either. He also taught the so called vehicle of gods and humans which concerns mundane ethics in order to create worldly benefit.

Tsongkhapafan said:

You ought to study the freedoms and endowments again. Not everyone has the karma to be a practitioner of Dharma. You can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make him drink.

That's a bit defeatist. At the very least one would work to give everyone the opportunity to practise Dharma if they have the propensity for it.

Malcolm wrote:

News flash! Not everyone has the propensity to practice Dharma. In fact, a very tiny minority of sentient beings have the propensity to practice Dharma. This is what it means to have a precious human birth with the eight freedoms and ten endowments.

In the meantime, secular ethics are necessary to keep the world from blowing itself up. Why? Because it is not possible to convert everyone to Buddhadharma. We do not live in the Kingdom of Shambhala.

Tsongkhapa said:

In the meantime, secular ethics are what the world needs. They will lead eventually to Dharma.

Humanism isn't going to lead to Dharma, and neither is politics or social change movements. The world needs a genuine spiritual path not secular ethics that implicitly deny the value of religion.

Malcolm wrote:

Sure it will. Humanism encourages people to develop compassion and love for others, and encourages them to avoid non-virtues of body, voice and mind. This will cause them to accumulate merit and continue to take rebirth in higher realms. This is precisely the vehicle of gods and men that the Buddha taught, for example, in the famed Kalamas Sutta.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 6th, 2015 at 6:33 AM

Title: Re: Gradual Teaching

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The three series are a literary division.

"Preliminaries, trekcho, togal and its visions" are not stages or levels.

Astus said:

So those literary divisions do not mean difference in the teachings, one superior to the other, etc?

If those are not stages/levels, then what? Gradual instructions maybe?

Malcolm wrote:

The three series do not mean that for example, man ngag sde is "superior" to the other two, though in fact it has been interpreted that way. The reality of it is that they focus on different aspects of Dzogchen teachings.

The preliminaries are for those who have not yet understood what the primordial state is. Tregchö and thögal are inseparable: sometimes however, tregchö is parsed as "sudden" and thögal as "gradual", but this too is in reality misleading.

The long and short of it is that Dzogchen teachings did not fit in the mold of gradual and sudden dichotomy [which is a conversation is only tangentially relevant to Dzogchen due to the conflict in Tibet over Indian and Chinese approaches to Mahāyāna sūtra]. They also do not fit into the mold of ultimate and relative truths. They do not fit into the

mold of paths and stages.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 6th, 2015 at 2:27 AM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The aggregates are a product of mind, correct?

Ye shes is a product of rig pa, correct?

M

alpha said:

At this point i will respectfully withdraw from this discussion.

Malcolm wrote:

You've got to know when to hold 'em, know when to fold 'em,

Know when to walk away, know when to run.

You never count your money when you're sittin' at the table,

There'll be time enough for countin' when the dealin's done.

—— The Gambler

```
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: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 6th, 2015 at 2:05 AM

Title: Re: Some Questions about DC

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Śakyamuni is one of the twelve teachers of Dzogchen teachings, beginning with Buddha Nanga Dampa and ending with Garab Dorje.

tomamundsen said:

Do we know what Dzogchen teachings Shakyamuni taught? Are there any tantras specifically revealed by Shakyamuni?

Malcolm wrote:

He did not explicitly teach Dzogchen, however, he predicted the arrival of Garab Dorje.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 6th, 2015 at 1:52 AM

Title: Re: Gradual Teaching

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Which levels, stages and practices?

Astus said:

Semde, longde, menngagde. Preliminaries, trekcho, togal and its visions. And probably there are others associated with or included in Dzogchen.

Malcolm wrote:

The three series are a literary division.

"Preliminaries, trekcho, togal and its visions" are not stages or levels.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 6th, 2015 at 1:20 AM

Title: Re: Gradual Teaching

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Shabkar Natsog Rangdrol wrote:

Rongzom Pandita wrote:

Astus said:

If there are no stages and practices, what are all those levels, stages, and practices in Dzogchen?

Malcolm wrote:

Which levels, stages and practices?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 6th, 2015 at 1:08 AM

Title: Re: Gradual Teaching

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is "No f**kin way!"

Queequeg said:

In this sense

or this sense?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 6th, 2015 at 12:44 AM

Title: Re: Gradual Teaching

Content:

DGA said:

that's the path of renunciation and negation.

the affirmative path (with a slightly different mantra) was posited some twenty to thirty years prior:

<https://books.google.com/books?isbn=0940183218>

Malcolm wrote:

Dzogchen is "No f**kin way!?"

Author: Malcolm

Date: Friday, November 6th, 2015 at 12:39 AM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

[It is the Dharma] in which one abides in sameness, like the supreme lotus of the world, not avoiding anything.

dzogchungpa said:

What does "like the supreme lotus of the world" mean?

Malcolm wrote:

According to Mipham:

Further, in the Dharma in which all desires of the world are mastered and is also the supreme of abundance, not covered by any faults like a lotus, one's conduct does not avoid anything. The reason for that is that there is no true difference between all faults and qualities, they are similar and not distinct, abiding in sameness.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 5th, 2015 at 11:59 PM

Title: Re: Gradual Teaching

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Who said the meaning of Prajñāpāramitā and Dzogchen were different? I merely said that in Dzogchen there were no caveats.

Astus said:

As you wrote, "Tibetan Buddhists in general interpret all sūtra paths as gradual paths". So, while there are five paths and ten bhumis, a bodhisattva does not get stuck by such conceptual fabrications.

"No caveats" here would mean that Dzogchen plays with open cards. How does it translate to the topic of gradual teachings?

Malcolm wrote:

Shabkar Natsog Rangdrol wrote:

The manner of obtaining each stage through the stages of the cause and result of the common vehicles, likewise the stage obtained through the effort and practice of creation and completion according to outer and inner secret mantra, here [in the Great Perfection] do not exist as [stages] upon which to train or make progress.

In reality, all vehicles are included and the paths and stages are complete within the single stage of one's pure vidyā.

Rongzom Pandita wrote:

To determine the greatness of the total non-existence of buddhahood, if buddhahood and non-buddhahood are non-dual, why is one seeking? Ascertain there is nothing to seek. The yogins in whom such a meaning is present effortlessly abide on the undifferentiated stage of Samantabhadra. The undifferentiated stage of Samantabhadra is the universal stage of all Buddhas. Whatever the meaning of the Great Perfection might be, that is it.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 5th, 2015 at 10:37 PM

Title: Re: Gradual Teaching

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

The Innermost Great Potentiality states:

The Soaring Garuda states:

The Cuckoo of Vidyā states:

Astus said:

"no suffering, origination, cessation or path; no gnosis, no acquisition and no non-acquisition. ... Due to non-acquisition, the bodhisattva, having relied on Perfect Wisdom, dwells without mental obstruction. From the non-existence of mental obstruction, he is fearless, he overcomes inverted erroneous views, and ultimately reaches Nirvāṇa."

([https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B4-](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B4-3ivsK5Q6MMWI3OGFjODctZTQ1Ni00NzU5LWJiOTgtMjdiNWM1YWE4N2Nk/view)

[3ivsK5Q6MMWI3OGFjODctZTQ1Ni00NzU5LWJiOTgtMjdiNWM1YWE4N2Nk/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B4-3ivsK5Q6MMWI3OGFjODctZTQ1Ni00NzU5LWJiOTgtMjdiNWM1YWE4N2Nk/view))

"if the bodhisattva refrains from taking up the practice of any particular dharma, because he does not apprehend any dharma whatsoever, he may thereby succeed in realizing prajñāpāramitā. How can this be the case? All practices are essentially false and unreal."

(Nagarjuna: Realization of Prajñāpāramitā through no Seizing on Practices, in http://kalavinka.org/Jewels/book_excerpts/N6P_excerpts/N6P_X-Bk4_X-15.pdf)

Malcolm wrote:

Who said the meaning of Prajñāpāramitā and Dzogchen were different? I merely said that in Dzogchen there were no caveats.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 5th, 2015 at 10:14 PM

Title: Re: Some Questions about DC

Content:

Queequeg said:

Regarding lineage...

ChNN seems to say that the DC lineage originates in Tibet... Is that correct? That's why I ask above about what place Shakyamuni has in the DC 'pantheon'.

Malcolm wrote:

He does not say this. He says [consistent with the teachings of the lineage] that Dzogchen originated in Oddiyāna, which was located somewhere in Pakistan.

Śakyamuni is one of the twelve teachers of Dzogchen teachings, beginning with Buddha Nanga Dampa and ending with Garab Dorje.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 5th, 2015 at 10:02 PM

Title: Re: Gradual Teaching

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No. "Sudden" does not apply to Dzogchen, neither does "gradual." That's like asking the question, "Is a bar of gold suddenly gold, or gradually gold."

Astus said:

That's like saying Dzogchen lacks the path to liberation, while that is not actually true. In other words, one can get to that bar of gold either through the process of digging, clearing and melting (or something

http://www.miningandmetallurgy.com/gold/assets/images/Gold_Technology_and_Gold_Production_Plant.PNG); or by discovering it in its pure form. The former is the gradual, the latter is the sudden way. It is of no help to say that the gold is already gold regardless of its location or information of its whereabouts.

Malcolm wrote:

The Innermost Great Potentiality states:

In the dhātu of all outer and inner phenomena,
the pure experiential field,
buddhas and sentient beings are nondual,
how can there be fabrication with a path?

The inner potentiality which does not need to be accomplished is free from aspiration,
it has already been naturally completed without activity.

The Soaring Garuda states:

The illness of those entering the path that is not a path is great;
those who wish to arrive are like wild animals chasing a mirage.

Since there is no object to attain, there is nothing other than the three realms.
Even relying on the tenth bhumi is an obstruction to awakening.

The Cuckoo of Vidyā states:

The primal nature of diversity is also nondual,
in reality, free from the proliferation of partiality.

“Just as it is” is also not conceptualized,

Vairocana, Samantabhadra.

Since it is perfect, the illness of effort is abandoned,
because of remaining naturally, equipoise.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 5th, 2015 at 9:34 PM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

alpha said:

We are not disputing the fact that the condition for them to be seen as wisdom is that one has to first discover the primordial state. And that is because this discussion is not about questioning our personal abilities to recognise them as such but is about what they are in truth.

Malcolm wrote:

As I said, not exactly.

The aggregates are a product of mind, correct? Mind is deluded correct? What a deluded mind perceives is a delusion, correct?

Ye shes is a product of rig pa, correct? Rig pa is undeluded, correct? What undeluded rig pa perceives is not a delusion, correct?

As the Pellucid Transcendent State[/i [dgongs pa zang thal] tells us, there is one basis, two paths, and two results. At the end of one of those paths lies the five aggregates and

samsara; and at the end of the other path is the five wisdoms and nirvana.

However, there is a way in which phenomena of samsara and the phenomena of nirvana are the same, as Mañjuśrimitra declares:

Therefore, because awakening and nonawakening are the same in terms of absence of characteristics, there is nothing to accept or reject.

So therefore:

[It is the Dharma] in which one abides in sameness, like the supreme lotus of the world, not avoiding anything.

And:

Abide in sameness without imputing duality, free from speech, nothing to do or to not do, nothing to accumulate or reduce.

And of course, it goes without saying we need to be careful about being arrogant about what we think we understand. As Mañjuśrimitra states:

The pride of promoting one's understanding and lording it over all, giving rise to attachment and aversion, is ignorance which does not see the meaning, producing conflict.

Mipham further clarifies this:

If one engages in grasping such as, "Freedom from all views is seeing the ultimate meaning," promoting the idea, "My understanding is the realization of the truth" and lording it over all, the pride caused by that view, causing attachment to one's own views and aversion towards views of others, is ignorance which produces conflicts. Since there is no so-called "truth" or "falsity", holding onto one's view as true and holding onto the views of others as false are thoughts that does not correspond to the way both exist. Therefore, the authentic meaning of not perceiving either true nor false is not seen.

M

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 5th, 2015 at 9:13 PM

Title: Re: Gradual Teaching

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

No caveats in Dzogchen...just saying...

Astus said:

Do you mean it is explicitly gradual or sudden?

(Sam van Schaik has a <https://books.google.hu/books?id=0Tg6AwAAQBAJ> on that subject.)

Malcolm wrote:

No. "Sudden" does not apply to Dzogchen, neither does "gradual." That's like asking the question, "Is a bar of gold suddenly gold, or gradually gold."

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 5th, 2015 at 10:05 AM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Ka dag is ye shes.

alpha said:

But yeshe is also the five aggregates, good and bad karma, our ego, our perceptions, emotions, etc...

Malcolm wrote:

Not exactly.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 5th, 2015 at 10:00 AM

Title: Re: Gradual Teaching

Content:

Queequeg said:

Let me modify my question - among active, living traditions?

Astus said:

Practically they all teach a gradual path. It's just that the <https://books.google.hu/books?id=LyfysMjKooEC> is naturally more popular.

If the unwise Bodhisattva counts the kotis of aeons,
And has the notion that it is long until the full attainment of enlightenment, he is bound to suffer,
And for a long time he will be suffering while moving unto Dharma.
Therefore he is inferior in the perfection of vigour, and essentially indolent.
(Ratnagunasamcayagatha, ch 30, tr Conze)

Queequeg said:

... all Sudden, with caveats... all Gradual, with caveats. Caveats, caveats, filling 84,000 volumes.

Brings me to the conclusion, "f**k it. Just do it."

Malcolm wrote:

No caveats in Dzogchen...just saying...

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 5th, 2015 at 5:32 AM

Title: Re: Gradual Teaching

Content:

Queequeg said:

Let me modify my question - among active, living traditions?

Malcolm wrote:

Tibetan Buddhists in general interpret all sūtra paths as gradual paths, generally considering other interpretations incorrect and baseless.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 5th, 2015 at 5:07 AM

Title: Re: the great vegetarian debate

Content:

seeker242 said:

<http://www.shabkar.org/scripture/sutras/index.htm>

Malcolm wrote:

None of these sūtras make the claim you are making, i.e. that eating meat is inherently harmful. They are mainly objecting to killing and then eating meat.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 5th, 2015 at 1:57 AM

Title: Re: Gradual Teaching

Content:

Queequeg said:

It occurred to me that, other than straw men in polemical screeds, I can't think of any Gradual Teaching Mahayana Buddhism. Is there such a thing? There are practices that appear Gradual in various traditions, but once you start scratching the surface, some Sudden teaching appears at a "deeper" level.

What do you think?

Malcolm wrote:

You need to read more Indian Mahāyāna sūtras and śāstras. Why do you think there is such a huge debate between Indian Buddhism and Chan?

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 5th, 2015 at 1:53 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

Lazy_eye said:

Sila is something a Buddhist undertakes as part of a practice aimed at personal transformation; it has no necessary bearing on the wider sociopolitical sphere. The latter should be based on "a political conception the principles and values of which all citizens can endorse."

Malcolm wrote:

Yes.

Lazy_eye said:

That distinction seems to neatly untangle certain problems, such as how a Buddhist should approach contentious issues such as abortion. The answer would seem to be that a Buddhist should personally practice sila, which includes non-killing. But since there is no "overlapping consensus" about the morality of abortion, it would be inappropriate for a Buddhist to join up with pro-lifers, for instance; this would constitute an extension of religious doctrine into the civic sphere.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct, this at least is my point of view, which is why I am personally opposed to abortion, but support a women's right to choose.

Lazy_eye said:

Now someone will raise the objection, "yes, but what about bodhicitta?" But the answer would be that bodhicitta does not apply here because the term actually refers to the process of personal transformation, that is, the aspiration for enlightenment. It doesn't mean the aspiration to become a moral crusader.

Malcolm wrote:

Correct.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 5th, 2015 at 1:48 AM

Title: Re: Non-Duality in Dzogchen vs Advaita Vedanta

Content:

Matt J said:

Is there a difference between gsal ba and ka dag? Is gsal ba also a potential?

Malcolm wrote:

gSal ba is a potential of ka dag. Ka dag is ye shes. This is the point that people do not seem to understand. Ka dag is the description of the original state of the basis, purity. The basis is ye shes, pristine consciousness, primordial wisdom, timeless awareness, [insert favorite calque here], etc.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 5th, 2015 at 1:15 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

Unnecessary.

What the world needs is a clearly articulated platform of secular ethics divorced from religions altogether.

Lazy_eye said:

Do you have any existing examples in mind, or anything that might serve as a useful model?

What would be the general outline of such a system?

Malcolm wrote:

There is a long discussion about this in the analytical philosophy tradition. Rawls in part answers your question:

The religious doctrines that in previous centuries were the professed basis of society have gradually given way to principles of constitutional government that all citizens, whatever their religious view, can endorse. Comprehensive philosophical and moral doctrines likewise cannot be endorsed by citizens generally, and they also no longer can, if they ever could, serve as the professed basis of society. Thus, political liberalism looks for a political conception of justice that we hope can gain the support of an overlapping consensus of reasonable religious, philosophical, and moral doctrines in a society regulated by it. Gaining this support of reasonable doctrines lays the basis for answering our second fundamental question as to how citizens, who remain deeply divided on religious, philosophical, and moral doctrines, can still maintain a just and stable democratic society. To this end, it is normally desirable that the comprehensive philosophical and moral views we are wont to use in debating fundamental political issues should give way in public life. Public reason—citizens' reasoning in the public forum about constitutional essentials and basic questions of justice—is now best guided by a political conception the principles and values of which all citizens can endorse (VI). That political conception is to be, so to speak, political and not metaphysical.

Political liberalism, then, aims for a political conception of justice as a freestanding view. It offers no specific metaphysical or epistemological doctrine beyond what is implied by the political conception itself. As an account of political values, a free-standing political conception does not deny there being other values that apply, say, to the personal, the familial, and the associational; nor does it say that political values are separate from, or discontinuous with, other values. One aim, as I have said, is to specify the political domain and its conception of justice in such a way that its institutions can gain the support of an overlapping consensus. In this case, citizens themselves, within

the exercise of their liberty of thought and conscience, and looking to their comprehensive doctrines, view the political conception as derived from, or congruent with, or at least not in conflict with, their other values.

Rawls, John (2011-02-10). Political Liberalism: Expanded Edition (Columbia Classics in Philosophy) (p. 10). Columbia University Press. Kindle Edition.

Author: Malcolm

Date: Thursday, November 5th, 2015 at 12:52 AM

Title: Re: Buddhism without buddism

Content:

Malcolm wrote:

In the meantime, secular ethics are what the world needs. They will lead eventually to Dharma.

Lazy_eye said:

Should it be Dharma-based secular ethics, or secular ethics within a Dharmic framework? Or is that not necessary?

Malcolm wrote:

Unnecessary.

What the world needs is a clearly articulated platform of secular ethics divorced from religions altogether.